

Brevard Public Schools

# Viera High School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>22</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>23</b> |

# Viera High School

6103 STADIUM PKWY, Viera, FL 32940

<http://www.vhs.brevardschools.org>

## Demographics

**Principal: Heather Legate L**

Start Date for this Principal: 5/15/2019

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>PK, 9-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 15%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (73%)<br>2017-18: A (73%)<br>2016-17: A (67%)<br>2015-16: A (63%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A  |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>23</b> |

## Viera High School

6103 STADIUM PKWY, Viera, FL 32940

<http://www.vhs.brevardschools.org>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School<br>PK, 9-12                          | No                     | 14%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 30%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A       | A       | A       | A       |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

Support, Inspire, and Motivate

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Opening doors to sculpt our students' future.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name            | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| Robinson, Sarah | Principal           | Prepare and manage the school's budget; read, interpret and enforce State Board Rules and School Board policy; Enforce collective bargaining agreements; Effective public relations skills; Analyze data; Effective interview techniques, coaching procedures and evaluation procedures; Effectively use public speaking skills; Effectively use problem solving skills; knowledge of current educational trends and research; knowledge of Human Growth and Development; knowledge of group dynamics. written and oral communication skills; skills in personnel management, interaction and supervision techniques. |
| Smith, Heather  | Assistant Principal | Communications skills of listening, oral communication and oral presentation; demonstrate interpersonal skills and abilities; knowledge of human growth and development. Extensive knowledge of curriculum; technical knowledge and skills to operate computer, enter data, analyze and process information; effective decision-making skills and management skills; evidence of enthusiasm, job tolerance, initiative and strong work standards for self and others.   |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 5/15/2019, Heather Legate L

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

112

**Demographic Data**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>PK, 9-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 15%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (73%)<br>2017-18: A (73%)<br>2016-17: A (67%)<br>2015-16: A (63%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

**Early Warning Systems****Current Year**



**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |     | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  |       |
| Number of students enrolled               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 525 | 513 | 547 | 507 | 2092  |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40  | 20  | 19  | 11  | 90    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35  | 22  | 18  | 10  | 85    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9   | 5   | 9   | 2   | 25    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8   | 14  | 17  | 15  | 54    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35  | 28  | 28  | 19  | 110   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18  | 18  | 17  | 24  | 77    |
|   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |       |
|   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |       |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 23 | 27 | 14 | 98    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 24 | 8  | 45    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0  | 2  | 1  | 5     |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 9/8/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |     | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 547 | 575 | 528 | 434 | 2084  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23  | 31  | 32  | 41  | 127   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17  | 17  | 21  | 17  | 72    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27  | 35  | 21  | 15  | 98    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17  | 43  | 22  | 19  | 101   |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 58 | 40 | 37 | 167   |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 34 | 25 | 1  | 68    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6  | 3  | 6  | 17    |

**Prior Year - Updated****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |     | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 547 | 575 | 528 | 434 | 2084  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23  | 31  | 32  | 41  | 127   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17  | 17  | 21  | 17  | 72    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27  | 35  | 21  | 15  | 98    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17  | 43  | 22  | 19  | 101   |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 58 | 40 | 37 | 167   |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 34 | 25 | 1  | 68    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6  | 3  | 6  | 17    |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 79%    | 59%      | 56%   | 75%    | 57%      | 53%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 66%    | 52%      | 51%   | 62%    | 51%      | 49%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 56%    | 40%      | 42%   | 52%    | 42%      | 41%   |
| Math Achievement            | 71%    | 48%      | 51%   | 65%    | 48%      | 49%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 64%    | 49%      | 48%   | 52%    | 43%      | 44%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 65%    | 45%      | 45%   | 40%    | 35%      | 39%   |
| Science Achievement         | 79%    | 66%      | 68%   | 85%    | 67%      | 65%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 83%    | 70%      | 73%   | 76%    | 67%      | 70%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) |     |     |     | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|           | 9                                 | 10  | 11  | 12  |       |
|           | (0)                               | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

#### Grade Level Data

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 09                    | 2019 | 82%    | 62%      | 20%                        | 55%   | 27%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 76%    | 60%      | 16%                        | 53%   | 23%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 10                    | 2019 | 75%    | 59%      | 16%                        | 53%   | 22%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 77%    | 61%      | 16%                        | 53%   | 24%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| SCIENCE |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        | 79%    | 66%      | 13%                   | 67%   | 12%                |
| 2018        | 84%    | 67%      | 17%                   | 65%   | 19%                |
| Compare     |        | -5%      |                       |       |                    |
| CIVICS EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2018        |        |          |                       |       |                    |

| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 83%    | 71%      | 12%                   | 70%   | 13%                |
| 2018         | 83%    | 70%      | 13%                   | 68%   | 15%                |
| Compare      |        | 0%       |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 64%    | 61%      | 3%                    | 61%   | 3%                 |
| 2018         | 64%    | 62%      | 2%                    | 62%   | 2%                 |
| Compare      |        | 0%       |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 72%    | 60%      | 12%                   | 57%   | 15%                |
| 2018         | 86%    | 60%      | 26%                   | 56%   | 30%                |
| Compare      |        | -14%     |                       |       |                    |

## Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 33       | 43     | 38          | 33        | 50      | 62           | 39       | 53      |           | 87                | 28                  |
| ELL                                       | 46       | 92     |             |           | 73      |              | 60       |         |           | 92                | 64                  |
| ASN                                       | 71       | 60     |             | 75        | 67      |              | 94       | 71      |           | 100               | 84                  |
| BLK                                       | 63       | 60     | 43          | 46        | 47      |              | 55       | 68      |           | 86                | 42                  |
| HSP                                       | 74       | 71     | 67          | 68        | 64      | 65           | 73       | 77      |           | 93                | 72                  |
| MUL                                       | 88       | 74     | 73          | 70        | 58      |              | 74       | 92      |           | 93                | 71                  |
| WHT                                       | 80       | 65     | 55          | 73        | 66      | 67           | 82       | 85      |           | 96                | 78                  |
| FRL                                       | 65       | 63     | 52          | 58        | 57      | 68           | 58       | 70      |           | 89                | 53                  |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 39       | 49     | 47          | 60        | 59      | 53           | 56       | 49      |           | 72                | 33                  |
| ASN                                       | 87       | 67     |             |           |         |              | 79       | 100     |           | 100               | 60                  |
| BLK                                       | 50       | 54     | 45          | 48        | 50      | 58           | 63       | 75      |           | 82                | 48                  |
| HSP                                       | 74       | 58     | 50          | 71        | 56      | 52           | 80       | 86      |           | 92                | 77                  |
| MUL                                       | 71       | 55     | 48          | 80        | 54      | 50           | 88       | 84      |           | 88                | 65                  |
| WHT                                       | 79       | 62     | 50          | 85        | 67      | 73           | 87       | 83      |           | 95                | 73                  |
| FRL                                       | 61       | 58     | 48          | 64        | 60      | 59           | 71       | 77      |           | 85                | 66                  |

| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD                                       | 34       | 47     | 43          | 38        | 38      | 21           | 58       | 47      |           | 79                | 33                  |
| ELL                                       |          | 20     |             | 71        | 91      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 84       | 63     |             | 88        | 88      |              | 100      | 64      |           | 91                | 60                  |
| BLK                                       | 60       | 58     | 41          | 53        | 57      | 43           | 76       | 63      |           | 97                | 66                  |
| HSP                                       | 75       | 61     | 60          | 64        | 55      | 48           | 81       | 73      |           | 89                | 70                  |
| MUL                                       | 72       | 63     | 65          | 62        | 49      | 58           | 81       | 79      |           | 100               | 63                  |
| WHT                                       | 77       | 62     | 50          | 66        | 50      | 36           | 86       | 79      |           | 94                | 70                  |
| FRL                                       | 66       | 50     | 39          | 55        | 51      | 45           | 80       | 66      |           | 88                | 57                  |

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 73  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 733 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10  |
| Percent Tested  | 98% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 47  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| English Language Learners   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 71  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0   |
| Native American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%         | 0   |

| Asian Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 78  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 57  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 72  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 77  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0   |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 75  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 63  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

## Analysis

**Data Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Overall achievement data indicates the lowest performance in ELA for the bottom quartile. While this component was the lowest performing component for consecutive years, it is important to note that there was a 7% increase in 2019 achievement compared to 2018. It is also worth noting that the achievement for this group continues to be above both the district and the state average. The area of greatest concern is the overall achievement of our students with disabilities in ELA, as only 33% demonstrated proficiency and only 38% demonstrated gains in learning. This is a 6% decline in ELA and 9% decline in learning gains compared to 2018.

One contributing factor to the 2019 school year's low performance is the fact that we had multiple new to English or new to Florida teachers during this year. 2019 was also the first year of implementing support facilitation and there was inadequate training and implementation. Inconsistency in scaffolding, implementation of intervention strategies and use of complex texts are also contributing factors.

The achievement gap data was shared with the staff. Professional development centered around Teacher Clarity, common language, instructional strategies, and interventions was implemented during the 2020 school year. Collaborative Mutual Accountability teams met monthly to work on learning intentions and success criteria. To build on the work from last year, we will focus heavily on equity to ensure success for ALL students.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

The greatest decline in performance from 2018 to 2019 was in overall math achievement, which decreased by 9%. Further examination of the data reveals that the Algebra 1 EOC achievement rate remained the same at 68%, while Geometry dropped from 87% to 72%, a 15% drop. The major factor contributing to this decline was the increase in the amount of students taking Liberal Arts Math during the 2018 school year, resulting in three times as many juniors/seniors testing in Geometry for the 2019 school year. The juniors and seniors performed at 27% and 14% proficiency, respectively, while freshman and sophomores performed at 86% and 73% proficiency.

For the 2021 school year, Liberal Arts math was removed as a course offering based on previous data. Making changes to our curriculum progression was essential to ensure equal access to rigorous opportunities. Progress monitoring and interventions for Algebra and Geometry students will be essential throughout this school year, as we will focus on ensuring equity in opportunity for ALL students at Viera High School.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

While overall achievement data indicates that Viera is performing above the state average, there are three subgroups that are under-performing compared to the state and district with respect to college and career acceleration: students with disabilities, black students, and economically disadvantaged students. Only 28% of our students with disabilities demonstrated college and career acceleration readiness, while the state average was 29% and the district's average was 33%. The state and district average for black students demonstrating college and career readiness were 50% and 48%, while 42% of black students at Viera demonstrated college and career readiness. Economically disadvantaged students



are demonstrating proficiency at 54% across the state, 56% across the district, and 53% at Viera High School. Proficiency for this area can be demonstrated through successful completion of an industry certification, earning a "C" or better in a dual enrollment course, and/or earning a level 3 or higher on an AP exam.

During the 2020 school year, CTE teachers were provided with professional development centered around literacy and instructional strategies in CTE. In 2021, the focus will continue to be equitable educational opportunities for all students by providing boot camps as interventions for struggling students, as well as additional certification testing opportunities in CTE.

### **Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

The component that showed the most improvement was ELA scores for our lowest quartile, with an increase of 7%. Multiple professional development opportunities were provided to teachers throughout the year that focused on Teacher Clarity, meaningful feedback and literacy across subject areas. Cross-curriculum collaborative planning days were held between ELA and Social Studies, focusing on integration of knowledge and ideas and incorporating text-based evidence, while using the district resource teachers and Viera's literacy coach to provide support to our teachers. Science teachers teamed up with the literacy coach to implement literacy strategies throughout science. Teachers also collaborated within their CMA groups to plan common assessments and analyze the data to drive instruction.

Work within the Collective Mutual Accountability teams continued throughout the year, with a focus on clarity and using a common language across disciplines. In the 2021 school year, we will focus school-wide on equity to ensure that all students are successful.

### **Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Examining the Early Warning Systems data for Viera, it is evident that there is a correlation between the grade level for which students take math state assessments and their achievement level. This correlation can be seen in both Algebra and Geometry. Of the students who scored a level 1 on the Algebra 1 EOC for the 2019 school year, only 22% were freshman. This data does not support the use of Algebra 1-A and 1-B to increase student achievement. As the grade level increase when the Geometry EOC is taken, the amount of students achieving level 1 increases (12%, 25%, 27%, and 35% for 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th, respectively).

All incoming freshman students were placed in Algebra 1 for the 2020 school year; Algebra 1A and 1B have been removed from the course offerings. For the 2021 school year, Viera will be focusing on equity with regards to academic placement, instruction, and social-emotional learning. Progress monitoring and formative assessments will be used to identify when students are struggling, and intervention strategies will be implemented as needed.

### **Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.**

1. Increasing student achievement for students with disabilities.
2. Increasing student achievement in ELA for the bottom quartile.
3. Increasing rigorous opportunities for all students.

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**



**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

Data indicates that there is a significant achievement gap, in multiple areas, for students with disabilities at Viera High School. While overall achievement in ELA and math are above the district and state averages, there is a significant gap between this group and their peers, with only 33% achieving proficiency in both ELA and math. Compared to the overall ELA achievement of 79% and the overall math achievement of 71%, there is a 46% and 38% achievement gap in ELA and math, respectively, between students with disabilities and their peers. Students with disabilities at Viera are demonstrating proficiency at 28% with regards to college and career acceleration, which is below both the state and district averages. This is 1% below the state average and 5% below the district average.

**Measurable  
Outcome:**

Since the identified area of concern is surrounding the achievement of students with disabilities in multiple areas, the measurable outcome of success will be dependent on the overall ELA and math achievement of students with disabilities at the completion of the 2020 school year. It is expected that students with disabilities will demonstrate an increase of 5% on both ELA and math state assessments. College and career acceleration for this group is also important to monitor. The ESSA Federal Index for students with disabilities for 2019 was 47% and with increases in the state categories mentioned, Viera's Federal Index should increase to 50% for the 2020 school year.

**Person  
responsible for  
monitoring  
outcome:**

Heather Smith (smith.heather@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

Viera will be utilizing the Collaborative Planning Framework, Teacher Clarity, and building relationships to support students with disabilities. Cross-curriculum collaboration will occur bi-monthly, while support-facilitation teachers will collaborate with general education teachers weekly. This collaboration will provide teachers opportunities to identify students needing interventions and plan the types of interventions needed.

**Rationale for  
Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

Based on student achievement scores and feedback from teachers, there was little collaboration occurring between ESE and general education teachers last year. Collaboration and communication between the ESE teacher and general education teacher is necessary to ensure that students' needs are being met. By collaborating regularly as a team and across contents, teachers will be able to plan instructional strategies and interventions that will maximize student achievement. Collaborative efforts should also focus on Teacher Clarity, which has an effect size of 0.75, to identify the learning intentions and success criteria for each standard to provide students with a clear understanding of what is being learned and how they will know when they are successful.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Monthly Professional Learning Teams facilitated by ESE teacher leaders that focuses on instructional strategies to support students with disabilities.
2. Create a collaborative mutual accountability team that includes ESE teachers and general education teachers that will meet monthly to analyze our current support facilitation model and discuss pluses and deltas.
3. Provide a weekly opportunity for ESE support facilitation teachers to plan

and collaborate with the general education teachers whose classes they support.

4. Dedicating one teacher to the Learning Lab who will be responsible for all students receiving pull out services, so that students are receiving consistent individual and small group instruction. This will also lighten the caseload for support facilitation teachers, which will allow them to focus on individual and small group instruction and accommodations within the content area classrooms.

5. Provide Professional Development, utilizing district resource teachers, focusing on instructional strategies for students with disabilities that will allow teachers to collaborate and plan multi-tiered interventions for students.

6. Professional Development for all teachers focusing on standards-based instruction and meaningful feedback.

7. Cross-curriculum collaborative planning days for 9th grade MESH and 10th grade MESH courses focusing on literacy and establishing common language across contents.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Heather Smith (smith.heather@brevardschools.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | While the 56% achievement in ELA for the bottom quartile is above both the state and the district averages, the significant gap between the bottom quartile and the remainder of the school raises concerns that not all students are being successful at Viera. There is a 23% achievement gap when comparing the bottom quartile to overall ELA achievement.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Increase in ELA achievement for lowest 25th percentile from 56% to 60%.<br>Based on student achievement in all content areas being greater than 60%, students in the bottom quartile should also be achieving at least 60% in ELA.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Heather Smith (smith.heather@brevardschools.org)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Viera will be utilizing the Collaborative Planning Framework, Teacher Clarity, and building relationships to support students in the bottom quartile.<br><br>The Collaborative Planning Framework focuses on teacher collaboration to provide multi-tiered levels of support for instruction. Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75, which is almost two years worth of growth in one year. By focusing on Teacher Clarity, it affords teachers the opportunity to collaborate on ensuring the quality of standards-based instruction across each content and it provides students with a clear understanding of what they need to learn and how they know they have learned it. By collaborating to breakdown the standards and plan intervention strategies, teachers can ensure that all students' needs are met. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     |   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Professional Development focusing on Teacher Clarity/standards-based instruction and building student-teacher relationships for all staff.
2. Collaborative Mutual Accountability teams that will meet monthly to focus on learning intentions, success criteria and examining data to implement interventions as needed.
3. Cross-curriculum planning days to develop learning intentions and success criteria to increase integration of knowledge and ideas, as well as key details (these two strands in FSA ELA continue to be the lowest).
4. Professional Development with the district resource teacher focusing on writing, utilizing The Writing Revolution, will increase teacher knowledge in effective strategies for teaching writing.
5. Share achievement gap data with teachers, examine data for underlying causes of the student achievement gap, and develop interventions for struggling students.
6. Increase monitoring of students exhibiting early warning indicators to provide interventions through the MTSS process.
7. Cross-curriculum collaborative planning days for 9th grade MESH and 10th grade MESH courses focusing on literacy and establishing common language across contents.

**Person Responsible** Heather Smith (smith.heather@brevardschools.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Examination of the student progression plans at Viera revealed that every student at Viera is not exposed to rigorous curriculum opportunities. Furthermore, data indicates that students with disabilities, black students and economically disadvantaged students at Viera High School are achieving below the district and state averages with regards to college and career acceleration.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Increase in student achievement on state assessments in math, ELA, Biology, and US History for students with disabilities by 3%. Increases in all students (and subgroups) demonstrating college and career readiness; students with disabilities will increase to 33% which is comparable to the district average, which would be a 5% increase. Black students will increase college and career readiness by 6% points, while economically disadvantaged students will increase by 3%; this would make both subgroups comparable to the district averages.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sarah Robinson (robinson.sarah@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Viera will work to bridge academic and social support to provide equitable opportunities for all students to be successful.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Research indicates that regardless of socio-economic or educational backgrounds, all students can be successful if provided the necessary academic and social supports. Viera has three subgroups that are performing below the state and district averages with regards to college and career readiness: students with disabilities, black students, and economically disadvantaged students. Viera needs to ensure equity for all students by ensuring that there are adequate supports in place to support both academic rigor and social emotional learning.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Updating student progressions in all content areas to ensure that students have access to more rigorous coursework. Based on student achievement data, Algebra 1-A and 1-B are not increasing student

achievement, therefore, beginning this school year, all students will begin their math sequence with Algebra 1. Student achievement on state assessments and overall academic performance will be utilized to identify the progression for each individual student, across all contents. It is important to note that implementation of new progression plans is a multi-year process and therefore immediate achievement data results is not expected in the first year.

2. Student voice surveys and feedback sessions will be conducted to ascertain students' interests and needs. Evaluation of student interest in CTE

offerings is needed as current feedback from students, guidance counselors and teachers indicate that current CTE offerings lack diversity in skill sets.

3. Use Post-Secondary funds to pay for after school tutoring for struggling students.

4. Continue implementing Hawkeye Mentoring Program for students in collaboration with community partners, as well as Sources of Strength.

5. Administration will conduct walkthrough observations and provide meaningful feedback to teachers to ensure that all students are receiving standards-based instruction in a positive learning environment.

6. Hiring of an additional guidance counselor to provide specific supports for the transition from middle to high school, freshman guidance and orientation, and early warning system indicator monitoring for 9th grade students. This will also reduce case loads for other counselors to provide interventions for struggling students and guidance for college and career preparation.

7. Share Opportunity Myth article, College Clearinghouse Data, and achievement gap data with all instructional staff during preplanning. Have departments work collaboratively to brainstorm ways to ensure opportunities for all students and to close the achievement gap. Professional development will focus on excellent instructional strategies to reach ALL students.

8. Cross-curriculum collaborative planning days for 9th grade MESH and 10th grade MESH courses focusing on literacy and establishing common language across contents.

**Person Responsible**

[no one identified]

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

#### **Parent and Family Engagement:**

**Viera continues to have strong family and community engagement. Feedback from parents indicated that parents would like to be more involved but were unsure of how to help or get involved, so a PTO was established during the 2020 school year that met once a month to provide parents with opportunities to connect to the school. During the 2020 school year, Mrs. Robinson met quarterly with parents and students to listen to and discuss updates and/or areas of concern. To improve engagement with parents and families, Mrs. Robinson will continue to meet with parents and students to gain insight and feedback. The PTO will continue to meet monthly as well to continue building a sense of community between VHS and the families it serves.**

#### **College and Career:**

**For the 2020 school year, Viera hired a new counselor that focused solely on 9th grade to assist with the transition from middle school to high school for both parents and students. This counselor also monitored early warning indicators for all freshman to provide supports and interventions. Viera will continue to have a counselor dedicated to serving freshman to continue focusing on the MTSS process for struggling freshman.**

## **Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The BPS parent survey revealed that 95% prefer email as the primary method of receiving important information from the school. As a result of this parent survey data, Mrs. Robinson will continue to send weekly emails detailing important school information to parents and families. Last year, students participated in the Youth Truth Survey, which indicated that VHS scored in the 6th percentile for student engagement in school. Based on this data, Viera High is working to increase student engagement and establish a positive culture of student belonging within in the school; the need to establish a positive culture within the staff at Viera High School was also evident in the Teacher Insight Survey. Viera High School will be designating 30 minutes every week as Hawk Time, in which students will focus on Mental Health, utilizing curriculum and Sources of Strength. This time will alternate between Mental Wellness, Sources of Strength, study hall, and highlighting all that VHS has to offer. VHS will also be implementing a Hawk of the Week positive reward system in which staff will nominate students and teachers each week, that will be announced at the end of each week. Teachers also indicated in the Insight survey that they needed more communication. To ensure that teachers are receiving consistent and accurate information, Mrs. Robinson will send a weekly newsletter to staff. Monthly meetings with the Parent/Teacher Organization and School

Advisory Council will also continue to ensure that all stakeholders are involved and providing input into improving the school.

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

### **Part V: Budget**

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

|        |        |  |        |
|--------|--------|--|--------|
| 1      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities            | \$0.00 |
| 2      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA                          | \$0.00 |
| 3      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |  | \$0.00 |