Veterans Park Academy For The Arts

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Veterans Park Academy For The Arts

49 HOMESTEAD RD S, Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

http://vpa.leeschools.net//

Demographics

Principal: Edwin Carter

Start Date for this Principal: 6/27/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Lee 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.

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

Veterans Park Academy For The Arts

49 HOMESTEAD RD S, Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

http://vpa.leeschools.net//

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	93%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

At Veterans Park Academy for the Arts, we strive to provide every student an avenue to success through academics, creative and expressive arts, and athletics.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Veterans Park Academy for the Arts partners with families and the community to develop productive and creative global citizens.

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
Blackmon, Mary	Principal	Serves as the visionary and instructional leader of the school. She sets the tone for a collaborative culture with the school and directs the staff to remain focused on the success of all students. Her primary goal is to ensure that collectively, all teachers embrace the understanding that all students are able and will make learning gains. Ms. Blackmon conducts weekly leadership meetings so that all decisions are based upon the data and are student centered. Our PLCs include School SIP Goals/grade/department teams who monitor the data and report back to our instructional leader. Ms. Blackmon and the entire administrative team attend, assist, and guide the PLCs.
Baxa, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	Provides curriculum guidance and support for leadership and teachers. Determines professional development needs through observations, discussions, and feedback from teachers. She guides the direction of (PLCs) Professional Learning Communities and holds teams accountable to safeguard that collaborative data driven instruction is implemented with fidelity.
Macchia, Mark	Assistant Principal	Provides curriculum guidance and support for leadership and teachers. Determines professional development needs through observations, discussions and feedback from teachers. He guides the direction of Professional Learning Communities and holds teams accountable to ensure that collaborative data-driven instruction is implemented.
Garlick, Clint	Assistant Principal	Provides curriculum guidance and support for leadership and teachers. Determines professional development needs through observations, discussions and feedback from teachers. He guides the direction of Professional Learning Communities and holds teams accountable to ensure that collaborative data driven instruction is implemented. Mr. Garlick is the AP over grades K-5. He monitors their attendance/discipline/academics and provides teacher support as needed.
Lundy, Helen	Assistant Principal	Provides curriculum guidance and support for leadership and teachers. Determines professional development needs through observations, discussions and feedback from teachers. She guides the direction of Professional Learning Communities and holds teams accountable to ensure that collaborative data-driven instruction is implemented.Mrs. Lundy oversees our L25/ESE/ELL populations to monitor attendance/discipline and academics.
Acosta, Janeli	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach for 7th and 8th grade.
Thomas, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	Middle School Science teacher and School Improvement Plan Coordinator.
Slough, Meredith	Instructional Coach	3-5 Academic Coach

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cruz, Andrea	Instructional Coach	K-2 Instructional Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/27/2018, Edwin Carter

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (53%)

	2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here]().	

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 11/2/2020

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	152	155	156	201	149	175	276	233	198	0	0	0	0	1695
Attendance below 90 percent	20	19	12	9	8	11	20	19	12	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	5	1	10	15	16	7	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	6	14	34	18	1	16	5	4	0	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	76	41	62	91	60	41	0	0	0	0	371

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	3	2	4	16	45	27	37	78	56	0	0	0	0	268

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	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	152	155	156	201	149	175	276	233	198	0	0	0	0	1695
Attendance below 90 percent	20	19	12	9	8	11	20	19	12	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	5	1	10	15	16	7	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	6	14	34	18	1	16	5	4	0	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	76	41	62	91	60	41	0	0	0	0	371

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	3	2	4	16	45	27	37	78	56	0	0	0	0	268

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	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	54%	62%	61%	55%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	60%	59%	58%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	53%	54%	54%	51%	51%
Math Achievement	56%	62%	62%	56%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	60%	61%	59%	56%	51%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	49%	52%	48%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	43%	54%	56%	51%	45%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	78%	78%	51%	65%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	48%	58%	-10%	58%	-10%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	55%	0%	58%	-3%
	2018	54%	53%	1%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
	2018	48%	52%	-4%	55%	-7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2019	46%	52%	-6%	54%	-8%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
07	2019	56%	51%	5%	52%	4%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	51%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	61%	57%	4%	56%	5%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	58%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	61%	-10%	62%	-11%
	2018	59%	58%	1%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	62%	-4%	64%	-6%
	2018	59%	58%	1%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	45%	58%	-13%	60%	-15%
	2018	42%	57%	-15%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
06	2019	35%	47%	-12%	55%	-20%
	2018	45%	41%	4%	52%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
07	2019	61%	57%	4%	54%	7%
	2018	67%	65%	2%	54%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
08	2019	68%	60%	8%	46%	22%
	2018	39%	47%	-8%	45%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		29%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	50%	-15%	53%	-18%
	2018	47%	52%	-5%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	49%	46%	3%	48%	1%
	2018	32%	48%	-16%	50%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	67%	5%	71%	1%
2018	67%	66%	1%	71%	-4%
Compare		5%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	91%	59%	32%	61%	30%
2018	98%	60%	38%	62%	36%
Compare		-7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	50%	-50%	57%	-57%
2018					

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	21	44	38	26	49	51	22	48			
ELL	38	49	42	40	44	40	25	69			
ASN	85	100		77	82						
BLK	49	53	49	50	61	52	45	67	61		
HSP	53	57	47	56	57	50	39	77	56		
MUL	69	58		60	71						
WHT	58	59	38	64	66	64	49	78	55		
FRL	50	54	50	51	56	54	36	74	65		

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	21	40	35	25	44	42	13	34			
ELL	31	51	48	45	48	32	8				
ASN	73	64		73	64						
BLK	52	52	45	51	60	55	25	65	64		
HSP	53	54	42	57	58	49	42	73	69		
MUL	82	84		79	80		64				
WHT	52	51	44	59	57	50	52	66	75		
FRL	52	53	42	54	58	50	37	67	68		

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	20	41	44	32	40	41	30	13			
ELL	26	50	45	32	60	64	25				
ASN	72	63		61	56						
BLK	51	61	61	47	50	45	45	53	38		
HSP	53	57	50	58	58	54	48	48	48		
MUL	79	71		75	52						
WHT	60	56	50	63	60	40	62	53	41		
FRL	50	55	52	50	52	45	47	47	43		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	554

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
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	86
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	52
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	55
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	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	59
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	54
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.

Math proficiency trends show that 4, 5, & 6th grade are showing a decrease. Some of the factors are teacher turn over, Administration changes, teacher attendance, and qualified in field teachers.

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

From fifth grade to sixth grade students in advanced math courses are no longer tested within 6th grade. These students are now in 7th grade math with only our lowest math students in 6th grade math classes.

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.

The greatest gap occurs in 5th and 6th grade math. Teacher attendance during instructional day has impacted our students. Students in advanced math courses are not included in 6th grade FSA math data. which leaves only the L1-2, and low 3's in 6th math. Scheduling in 5th grade with students being in large classes with less support contributed to this gap..

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

7th and 8th grade math showed the most improvement. Teachers were focused on standards and had training & prior experience in their field of study. Teachers were focused on standards in PLCs with lessons that were designed with test specs and multiple learning experiences.

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

Failures don't match students FSA Scores in grades 3rd and 6th.

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

1.Increase scores and gains of L25
2. Math proficiency and gains
3. ELA proficiency and gains
4. teacher retention/attendance
5. focused intervention

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based off FSA Science data VPAA will increase from 43% to 46% proficiency as measured by the FY20 FSA Results.
Measurable Outcome:	VPAA will increase the number of students who have proficiency levels in 5th and 8th grade.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Blackmon (maryabl@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will employ high yielding strategies that align their planning and instruction to the standards. The depth of knowledge questioning and student led cooperative groups will use a variety of Kagan Strategies to increase their mastery of the standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With fidelity, VPAA will monitor progress on an ongoing basis in order to identify areas for remediation. Teachers will use: test specs, standards-based lessons, and hands on learning and application of the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data Review
2. Test specs and design standards based lessons.
3. Identify area of greatest need.
4. Targeted small group instruction with supports.
5. Progress monitoring.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Baxa (kimberlybb@leeschools.net)

. Teachers will review Writescore data, and review data with students.
2. Teachers will utilize standard score, and grade level equivalency to plan differentiated instructions.Based on the test specs, teachers will design standards based lessons that focus on specific standards.
3. VPAA identify conventions as the greatest need in the 6, 7, and 8th grade scores. Teachers will focus on helping students develop supporting details.
4. Targeted small group instruction with supports - Teachers will pull ESE students, and give ESE support.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

1. Teachers will analyze quarterly progress monitoring data, and review data with students.
2. Teachers will plan differentiated instructions to help students in all lessons.
3. VPAA science teachers identified experiments, variables, data, and conclusions as the greatest need in the 6, 7, and 8th grade scores.
4. Targeted small group instruction with supports - Teachers will pull ESE students, and give ESE support. Science coach will work teachers, and student set goals for an points improvement in each domain.
5. VPAA will conduct ongoing progress monitoring. Teachers will analyze each quarter's progress monitoring to help students improve their performance.
6. Researched based learning for K-5
7. Utilize STEM teacher for K-5 enrichment.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on VPAA data collected from 18-19 FSA Math results, students showed minimal gains in math proficiency and learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the % of L25 students making learning gains in Math from 55% to 58% as measured by FY 20 Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Blackmon (maryabl@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted direct small group instruction utilizing best strategic practices embedded throughout the standards based lesson.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring will be used throughout instruction to identify areas for remediation. Teachers will use test specs, standards based lessons, and hands on application.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data Review
2. Test specs and design standards based lessons.
3. Identify area of greatest need.
4. Targeted small group instruction with supports.
5. Progress monitoring.

Person Responsible   Jaclyn Kustra (jaclynk@leeschools.net)

1. Weekly, teachers conduct progress monitoring within the established state standards. Teachers review students' performance data during Math Professional Learning Community (PLC) time.
2. Teachers will focus on test specs and design standards-based lessons based on students' areas of weakness. Teachers will focus on the following standards MAFS.8.NS.1.1, MAFS.8.NS.1.2, MAFS.8.EE 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4.
3. Identify an area of greatest need- L25 students and students identified as scoring close to the next achievement level targeted for extra support.
4. Targeted small group instruction with supports- iReady: My Path /ESE pull out and push in/teacher identified small group-Math and ESE Teachers.
5. Progress Monitoring-District Formatives and iReady Diagnostic Reports.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on VPAA data collected from 18-19 FSA ELA results, students showed minimal gains in ELA proficiency and learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the % of L25 students making learning gains in ELA from 46% to 49% as measured by FY 20 Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Blackmon (maryabl@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted small group instruction with lessons based off standards driven strategic practice.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring will be used throughout instruction to identify areas for remediation. Teachers will use test specs, standards based lessons, and hands on application.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data Review
2. Test specs and design standards based lessons.
3. Identify area of greatest need.
4. Targeted small group instruction with supports.
5. Progress monitoring.

Person Responsible   Kimberly Baxa (kimberlybb@leeschools.net)

1. Teachers will review Writescore data, and review data with students.
2. Teachers will utilize standard score, and grade level equivalency to plan differentiated instructions.Based on the test specs, teachers will design standards based lessons that focus on specific standards.
3. VPAA identify conventions as the greatest need in the 6, 7, and 8th grade scores. Teachers will focus on helping students develop supporting details.
4. Targeted small group instruction with supports - Teachers will pull ESE students, and give ESE support. ELA coach will work to help every student set goals for an points improvement in each domain.
5. VPAA will conduct ongoing progress monitoring. Teachers will analyze December test WriteScore and make adjustments in instructions.
6. Critical Thinking for the district lowest 25th every other day based on the iReady Learning Path.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students will reduce the number of ISS or OSS by participating in mentoring experiences that will be provided throughout the school year along with positive behavior supports to focus on the change of identified behavior(s) and promote student success.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of students in ISS or OSS will be reduced from last year as determined by the District Support Applications Report.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Blackmon (maryabl@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We have implemented a Leader in Me class with our identified students with more than 10 referrals in 2018-2019. Our goal is to teach behavior modification and conflict resolution. We will use this class for a mentoring opportunity to build relationships with these students. We are also staffed with 2 guidance counselors and a social worker to help with interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with positive adult relationships at school have a vested interest in being at school and doing well.

Action Steps to Implement

1.Monitor enrollment of LiM class in MS.
2. Create small groups for mentoring.
3. Provide training to the teacher and lessons to teach during this class focusing on positive decisions and choices
4. Monitor student discipline, attendance, and grade.
5. Reward positive behavior choices by positive notes and celebrations throughout the year.
6. Character Education
7. Positive Behavior Implementation

Person Responsible Jaclyn Kustra (jaclynk@leeschools.net)

VPAA established:
1. check-in and check-out with students that demonstrate behavior concerns.
2. Peer mediations with peer conflicts.
3. We are offering positive incentives as a motivator for preferred student behavior.
4. Restorative practices (apologies, behavior lessons, etc.)
5. Teachers utilize infraction cards before referrals.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Regular attendance at school is necessary for student achievement. VPAA tracks student daily attendance through FOCUS and students track through their student data folders.At the end of the 2018-2019 school year we averaged a 95.19% attendance.
Measurable Outcome:	Student attendance at VPAA will increase from the previous year as determined by the district attendance report provided each quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Blackmon (maryabl@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students graph attendance monthly in their student data folder. Parents receive the district information about the ABC of success. Administration, Teachers, and school personal monitor and maintain frequent communication with families about attendance concerns. Celebrate students success of attendance every quarter.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Engaging the students in graphing attendance monthly in their student data folder provides ownership of their attendance. Keeping the families informed of the importance of attendance will help reduce absences and tardies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. As of November 5, 2020, Veterans Park Academy for the Arts (VPAA) attendance data averages 95.7%.
VPAA provides all families with the Attendance, Behavior, and Classroom (ABC) sheet, which explains the importance of daily attendance.
2. Students with excessive absences, a weekly letter is sent home, along with another ABC attendance letter.
3. The letters are documented in Focus. Reward good attendance.
4. Monitor attendance reports. If the absences continue, the social worker gets involved with the family.

Person Responsible	Mark Macchia (marknm@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Standards based instruction
Backwards design of instruction
Adhering to the Instructional Guides
Utilize Math Data Coach

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.

At the beginning of the school year, families and students will be invited to an open house and the Annual Title I meeting where staff will share the vision, mission, and culture of the school. We provide clear expectations and build student study habits through new implementation of AVID, Kagan, and Standards Based Learning. At VPAA will provide information to all stakeholder through Peachjar, School Messenger, Web-site, and our soon to be new electronic school sign in regards to school progress, volunteer opportunities, and school functions. Parents, teachers, students, community members and business partners will participate in the comprehensive needs' assessment by VPAA' s School Advisory Council's processes and events or meetings to include: curriculum events, and sharing and analyzing data for all student groups including regular ed, ESE, gifted, migrant, ELLs, L25, educationally disadvantaged and historically under served, identifying school needs). Stakeholders will participate as the result of invitations through the school newsletter, School Messenger, Peach Jar, personal phone call, transportation, flexible meeting times, etc. Parents and stakeholders will fill out surveys after each school activity through QR Code on their mobile devices. Data collected will allow us to make changes to improve the relationships between home and 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: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00