

Collier County Public Schools

Veterans Memorial Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Veterans Memorial Elementary School

15960 VETERANS MEMORIAL BLVD, Naples, FL 34110

<https://www.collierschools.com/vme>

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Vie IR A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	42%
2020-21 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (74%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Collier 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Veterans Memorial Elementary School

15960 VETERANS MEMORIAL BLVD, Naples, FL 34110

<https://www.collierschools.com/vme>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	28%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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.

Developing tomorrow's leaders today.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create a learning community, committed to high quality teaching and learning to support the success of every student, teacher, and staff member in reaching high standards of performance.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vieira, Jessica	Principal	
Hamor, Katie	Assistant Principal	
Badiu, Jocelyn	Administrative Support	
Hudson, Heidi	Reading Coach	
Smith, Carie	Instructional Media	
Ruben, Andrew	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Jessica Vie IR A

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

729

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

1

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	99	120	116	135	122	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	2	9	7	7	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	2	7	3	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	2	5	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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

Wednesday 9/29/2021

2020-21 - 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	79	120	143	122	131	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	745
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	3	6	2	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

2020-21 - 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	79	120	143	122	131	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	745
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	3	6	2	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	5	7	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				82%	60%	57%	76%	61%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				75%	59%	58%	63%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	51%	53%	48%	54%	48%
Math Achievement				84%	68%	63%	84%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				64%	64%	62%	61%	65%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	55%	51%	64%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				77%	59%	53%	73%	60%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	85%	61%	24%	58%	27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	58%	20%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	60%	21%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	90%	68%	22%	62%	28%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	76%	65%	11%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				
05	2021					
	2019	82%	67%	15%	60%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	76%	56%	20%	53%	23%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

- iReady Diagnostics - 1st and 2nd ELA
- District Quarter Benchmarks for Math and ELA - 3rd, 4th, 5th
- District Quarter Benchmarks for Science - 5th

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42	58	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	54	68
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	33
	English Language Learners	27	33	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53	67	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	39	55
	Students With Disabilities	35	53	53
	English Language Learners	0	22	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76	78	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	70	63
	Students With Disabilities	78	73	46
	English Language Learners	43	44	44
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	77	80	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	66	64	38
	Students With Disabilities	56	55	46
	English Language Learners	71	56	22

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	75	79	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	65	56
	Students With Disabilities	55	55	28
	English Language Learners	50	53	47
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75	80	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	55	72	47
	Students With Disabilities	35	50	28
	English Language Learners	50	71	33
	Grade 5			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67	71	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	57	58
	Students With Disabilities	53	58	47
	English Language Learners	38	45	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	76	71	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	63	54	36
	Students With Disabilities	70	68	47
	English Language Learners	63	40	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	65	72	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	52	58
	Students With Disabilities	45	65	70
	English Language Learners	38	20	25

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	55	54	60	60	57	73	68				
ELL	58			73							
ASN	82			82							
BLK	62	50		62	70						
HSP	68	66		70	52	54	71				
WHT	86	68	65	85	58	50	86				
FRL	63	63	47	71	53	55	66				
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	62	67	65	64	63	58	43				
ELL	67	62	50	61	59	52	38				
BLK	63	64	50	67	64						
HSP	74	70	52	71	50	48	56				
MUL	80			87							
WHT	88	78	75	90	68	41	87				
FRL	73	65	53	70	51	53	58				
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	52	50	31	60	46	57	44				
ELL	44	61	53	58	66	68					
BLK	41	40		65	56						
HSP	61	52	43	69	58	61	54				
MUL	87	70		87	30						
WHT	84	69	62	91	63	71	80				
FRL	64	54	43	74	62	62	51				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	537

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	61
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	63
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Students with disabilities and those identified as English Language Learners are performing lower in Math and ELA across grade levels.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math gains overall and for students in the lowest 25% in math demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors to this area of need were state assessment results and district progress monitoring results. Small-group intervention in mathematics will need to be implemented. Tracking progress for students identified as lowest 25% in mathematics will need to occur on a regular basis.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our ELA showed the most improvement overall when looking at our progress monitoring and 2019 state assessment.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

MTSS in ELA has been occurring regularly. Students receive small-group intervention when data shows tier 1 is not successful. Students receives tier 3 intervention which is more intensive than tier 2 when data indicated tier 2 is not successful.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In order to accelerate learning, frequent progress monitoring will need to occur. Progress monitoring must include the lowest 25% and the highest 25% in all classes. Tier 1 intervention needs to be monitored and evaluated for effectiveness before moving on to new standards and benchmarks.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will occur in differentiation, instructional strategies, and data-based decision making.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Grade-level data sheets will be implemented and discussed with administrative support during monthly data PLCs. Collaborative planning will include the Literacy Specialist and an administrator to provide support on unpacking standards and teaching within the scope and sequence.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	State data indicated student making gains in math was lower in school year 2021 than in the last three years of state testing. This downward trend indicates a critical need for improvement. Students making gains in math was our third lowest scoring category for school grade.
Measurable Outcome:	All students will make a gain in math to increase school math gains 6% on FSA demonstrating and increase on FSA from 58% in FY21 to 64% in FY22 by the end of the 21-22 school year.
Monitoring:	Students take a quarterly benchmark assessment that is predictive of FSA performance. Quarterly math data analysis will be held by grade level after each district benchmark to define areas of growth and share best practices in math. All teachers will track individual student data spreadsheet for quarterly district math assessments, scale scores on our HMH Math Growth Measure in grades K-3, and ALEKs progress in 4th and 5th grade.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katie Hamor (hamorc@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tracking data and making data-based instructional decisions will be implemented for this area of focus. Exit tickets and formative assessment will be utilized continuously to track progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tracking data is an element identified by Marzano which is the instructional model in the CCPS school district. Data will be used to identify interventions for students, determine the effectiveness of instructional practice in classrooms, and determine specific focus areas for enrichment. Exit tickets and ongoing formative assessment will provide data teachers can use to make instructional decisions and provide feedback to students regarding performance and next steps to increase proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly data PLCs will be held with all grade levels to review data and progress. Decision-making for interventions and enrichment will occur, best practices for instructional strategies by state standards will be shared, and quarterly benchmark data will be reviewed.

Person Responsible Jessica Vieira (vieiraje@collierschools.com)

Quarterly math benchmark analysis will be conducted with grades 3, 4, and 5 to review student work and trends in the data. Teachers will analyze data by benchmark and identify a plan for students who are not making adequate progress and/or reaching proficiency.

Person Responsible Katie Hamor (hamorc@collierschools.com)

Collaborative planning for math will occur weekly to ensure understanding of the scope and sequence of state standards and district identified learning goals.

Person Responsible Katie Hamor (hamorc@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students identified as our lowest 25% in math making gains was our lowest performing category in school grade.

Measurable Outcome: All students identified as lowest 25% in math will increase their performance in math by 3% on FSA from 53% in FY21 to 56% in FY22 by the end of the 21-22 school year.

Monitoring: Students identified as the lowest 25% in math will be monitored using district quarterly benchmarks assessments which are predictive of FSA performance. Additionally, ALEKS, Waggle, and unit assessment data will be used as formative assessment data. Instruction and planning will be monitored through classroom observations and collaborative planning sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katie Hamor (hamorc@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Tier 1 focus on grade-level standards will be implemented and supported by leadership through grade-level collaborative planning and administrative observations. Small-group mini lessons, exit tickets, and ongoing formative assessment will be utilized.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The strategy was selected based on a need for increased tier 1 instruction. Historical data show students in the lowest 25% are not making gains at the same rate as other learners. Small-group, exit tickets, and ongoing formative assessment allow teachers to collect data that is used to make instructional decisions that meet the needs of all learners, and provide individual feedback to students.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative planning focus on differentiation and monitoring of ongoing formative assessment to determine progress of daily math target.

Person Responsible: Jessica Vieira (vieiraje@collierschools.com)

Data monitoring of students identified as lowest 25% at monthly PLC meetings with grade-level teams as well as progress monitoring during weekly, small-group intervention.

Person Responsible: Jessica Vieira (vieiraje@collierschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Past FSA data has shown that students in our lowest 25% quartile have not made the same gains as all of our students.

Measurable Outcome: VME will increase gains for the lowest 25% in English Language Arts by 3% on the FSA from 53% in FY21 to 56% in FY22 by the end of the 21-22 school year.

Monitoring: Students will be monitored throughout the year using quarterly district benchmark assessments, I-Ready, and culminating tasks. Data meetings will be conducted to track the progress of students and have discussions to determine any adjustment of tier 1 and tier 2 instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Heidi Hudson (hudsonhe@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standards-based alignment of activities, exit tickets, and formative assessments will be implemented.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Standards-based alignment of activities is a research-based strategy that is used to ensure the depth of knowledge of student activities match that of the standard. Exit tickets and formative assessment of standards-aligned activities allow teachers to make instructional decisions, and provide individual feedback to students.

Action Steps to Implement

Grade-level, monthly PLC meetings focused on individual student data tracking and MTSS groups.

Person Responsible: Jessica Vieira (vieiraje@collierschools.com)

Weekly tracking of iReady proficiency scores for all students grades K-5 shared will be shared with all grade levels.

Person Responsible: Heidi Hudson (hudsonhe@collierschools.com)

Professional learning opportunities will be offered to model and discuss effective planning and lesson delivery.

Person Responsible: Heidi Hudson (hudsonhe@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Veterans Memorial Elementary ranked 575 out of 1,395 in the statewide school incident ranking. Veterans Memorial reported 0.4 incidents per 100 students which is less than the statewide elementary rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. An area of focus this year will be to decrease the amount of violent incidents that occur. This is our only area of concern as all other areas were reported as very low incidents. School culture and environment will be monitored by our active PBIS committee and our many facets of Leader in Me. Our PBIS team will analyze discipline and behavior data to determine the need for tier 1 modification, tier 2 implementation, and tier 3 implementation. Positive incentives are put into place based on the needs of the students and trends in the data. Our leadership team and Leader in Me Action Teams will also be involved in the analysis of discipline data and the implementation of a plan to monitor a positive culture and climate. We have a culture action team that focuses on student leadership as well as many student leadership teams that enable students to be school-wide leaders and role models.

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.

VME is a school with strong support from stakeholders. Utilizing the Leader in ME framework VME makes strides every year to employ strategies to impact a positive school culture. Teachers and staff feel valued in the decisions that are made with staffing and school-wide decisions. Students are also an important part of the decision making at VME, we utilize surveys to determine the wants and needs of our student population. VME also has a strong relationship with FGCU. FGCU classes and interns are a part of our VME campus, they learn directly from VME teachers under the guidance of their FGCU supervisor. Our communication with parents and open door policy foster a sense of belonging for parents as well. Parent input is valued in school decision making. Surveys along with meetings with our PTO and SAC (School Advisory Council) allow us to disseminate information and get feedback from these stakeholders. Our PTO is highly involved and feels important in the decisions that are made for students.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

School Advisory Council makes funding decisions that support the initiatives in our school improvement plan.

Parent Teacher Organization plans school-wide events that help all students and families feel they are a part of the VME family. Events are open to all families and build a sense of belonging and builds a celebratory school culture.

Staff promote a positive culture by integrating Leader in Me into daily lessons and the school environment. Teaching students how to be leaders fosters independence and a sense of ownership within the school. Volunteers allow us to engage in activities such as field trips which give students various experiences they may not have otherwise. These experiences bring school to life with real-life examples of what we are learning.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00