

Washington County School District

Vernon Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Vernon Elementary School

3665 ROCHE AVE, Vernon, FL 32462

<http://ves.wcsdschools.com>

Demographics

Principal: Steve Griffin

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

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	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Washington 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Vernon Elementary School

3665 ROCHE AVE, Vernon, FL 32462

<http://ves.wcsdschools.com>

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	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	20%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Washington 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.

Vernon Elementary School is committed to the personal and academic excellence for every student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vernon Elementary School will provide students the highest quality education possible, with the resources necessary, so they can achieve their maximum potential and become knowledgeable, responsible, and competent 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Griffin, Steve	Principal	
English, Latina	Assistant Principal	
Haddock, Kaye	School Counselor	
McKenzie, Renea	Instructional Coach	
Harmon, Montez	Instructional Coach	
Park, Karri	Teacher, K-12	
Brock, Brandi	Teacher, K-12	
Brown, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Yates, Vicky	Teacher, K-12	
Justice, Florence	Teacher, K-12	
Kirkland, Heidi	Teacher, K-12	
Ledet, Karen	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Steve Griffin

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

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

550

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.

3

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	90	96	84	84	86	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	25	16	14	11	19	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	7	5	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	60	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	6	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	9	17	9	9	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/26/2021

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	89	97	88	91	78	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	12	26	15	21	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	13	6	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	89	97	88	91	78	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	12	26	15	21	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	13	6	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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				54%	59%	57%	54%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	59%	58%	47%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	49%	53%	41%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				58%	64%	63%	63%	67%	62%
Math Learning Gains				56%	63%	62%	48%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	47%	51%	38%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				40%	48%	53%	53%	57%	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	63%	60%	3%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	65%	-4%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	50%	-10%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	48%	51%	-3%	62%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	77%	1%	64%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	60%	-15%	60%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	37%	47%	-10%	53%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i Ready Math and Reading

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12	31	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	0	NA	1
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12	19	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	0	NA	1
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22	32	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	0	NA	1
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	18	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	0	NA	0
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53	58	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	2	NA	4
	English Language Learners	0	NA	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	26	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	0	NA	3
	English Language Learners	0	NA	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22	32	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	0	NA	0
	English Language Learners	0	NA	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14	32	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	0	NA	2
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26	33	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	0	NA	2
	English Language Learners	0	NA	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19	33	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	NA	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	NA	NA	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	5
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	25	19	17	35	50	50	11				
BLK	30	25		33	33		23				
MUL	68	45		60	45		45				
WHT	61	53	50	62	60	63	47				
FRL	51	38	35	52	47	43	29				
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	25	43	43	38	37	22	19				
BLK	52	59		47	59						
MUL	50			55							
WHT	56	57	53	59	57	41	41				
FRL	50	57	53	56	58	43	36				
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	24	43	36	41	45	36	33				
BLK	32	45		54	30		46				
MUL	57	75		50	50						
WHT	56	45	31	66	52	41	56				
FRL	51	46	43	61	46	41	54				

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	353
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	57
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	42
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?

During these times of the COVID pandemic, all grade levels, subgroups and core content areas are dealing with absenteeism of instructional staff and students due to quarantines and sickness. With school closing in the 18-19 school year, the gaps and holes in student learning have widened and continue to widen.

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

The greatest need for improvement is in 3rd grade Math and then 5th grade ELA and Math.

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 largest group of Innovative Learning Environment students were in 5th grade. These students were not on campus and received their instruction virtually through FLVS.

The pandemic was a contributing factor as well.

Quarantines/Absenteeism of instructional staff and students

Mental health of students

New actions to address improvement are:

Afterschool started the 3rd week of school and will include Math for grades 1-5.

Third grade now has 2 highly effective teachers teaching all the Math to the grade level.

More one on one instruction

Small group instruction

Close attention to the mental health of students

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

4th grade Math

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

One on one instruction
Small Group Instruction
Smaller class sizes
Being cognizant of the mental health of students and working with the mental health counselor, referring students
Grace and compassion
Learning and using digital resources to help students and parents.

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

One on one instruction
Small group instruction
Intentional and intensive instruction
Meaningful work in emergency plans as quarantines continues
Digital resources used to individualize instruction in the classroom during MTSS/FLEX time when an adult is unavailable to deliver instruction

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.

HMH Reading Program- unpacking the new curriculum
Academic analysts will provide Professional Dev. as needed

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

After school program that will focus on Math and Reading
Full time mental health counselor on campus
Dedicated MTSS/FLEX time for students that focuses on both Math and Reading
Resources dedicated to give individualized enrichment to each student based on needs. These include: iReady, iXL, Prodigy Math, Waggle, and Accelerated Reader.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In grades 3-5 students with disabilities that are on a standard diploma are in general education inclusion classrooms. In grades 3-5 a certified ESE teacher travels between 2 classrooms and assists in Mathematics and English/Language Arts classes. The data shows SWD have scored lower on state assessments. Ideally with support and exposure they will experience greater success on assessments. The students are also grouped according to needs for their MTSS/FLEX time with general education students as needed.

Measurable Outcome: SWD will score equal to or above the state average on the FSA ELA.

Monitoring: Progress Monitoring through iReady Reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Montez Harmon (montez.harmon@wcsdschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Inclusion model classroom with MTSS pull out instruction based on individual student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The district has moved towards this model. Due to COVID last year, there were some new roadblocks. We are using the same strategies and hope to see the scores soar. The resources include the ESE teacher, Read Works, Snap and Read, and other programs to address deficiencies. Teachers will also use digital resources made available including Prodigy Math, iXL, Waggle and Accelerated Reader.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will take the iReady beginning assessment and work at their level. They will also receive quality classroom instruction coupled with small group instruction at least 3 times a week to help with mastery of standards.

Person Responsible Montez Harmon (montez.harmon@wcsdschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Small group instruction at VES occurs during core instruction time, but it also occurs during the Multiple Tier System of Supports block or MTSS. MTSS is scheduled for each grade level in 30 minute increments. Paraprofessionals that are trained in multiple programs including Connect to Comprehension, Tyner, Great Leaps, and iReady also work with teachers to help students. Small group instruction keeps groups small giving extra support in various areas. Teachers and paraprofessionals collaborate and the groups remain very fluid and flexible. Documentation of what occurs daily in the groups is maintained on a student calendar. Student iReady scores and class assessments are used to determine the best instructional approach to help students with their deficiencies.

Measurable Outcome:

Progress monitoring, such as iReady, STAR, FLKRS, and UPAR, teacher observation, and classroom assessments will be used to measure the outcome. Students in grades 5 scored lower than the district and state average in both areas of Math and English. With only 49% of students in grades 5 scoring achievement in ELA and only 50% scoring achievement level in Math. The district average was 51% achievement in ELA and 53% achievement in Math. The state average was 54% achievement in ELA and 51% achievement in Math.

Monitoring:

Progress monitoring through iReady for Math and Reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Montez Harmon (montez.harmon@wcsdschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Small group instruction will incorporate deliberate instruction using research and standards based curriculum and resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The state mandates MTSS for certain students but after looking at previous years' data we need to address strengths too. Due to COVID last year, the data was not made available. We are using the same strategies and hope to see the scores soar. The resources include the discussions amongst teachers and paraprofessionals as they use: Connect to Comprehension, Read Works, Snap and Read, and other programs to address deficiencies. Teachers will also use digital resources made available including Prodigy Math, iXL, Waggle and Accelerated Reader.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers and the academic analysts will look at classroom assessments, goals per IEPs and progress monitoring data to group students to target their needs. Once this data has been collected and analyzed, the team will split students into groups and develop systematic strategies and plans to address student needs.

Person Responsible

Montez Harmon (montez.harmon@wcsdschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percentage of students in grade 5 that scored below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment was 51%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of fifth grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring using iReady and teacher assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Montez Harmon (montez.harmon@wcsdschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction using the core curriculum HMH and other resources including Phonics, Connect to Comprehension , QuickReads, Lakeshore Reading Comprehension Journals, and Snap and Read will be used.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will receive 30 minutes of direct instruction in addition to the Core reading instruction to focus on areas where they have scored low per the progress monitoring assessments that are standards based.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will be identified based on last year FSA scores as well as the beginning of the year iReady diagnostic. Students will be grouped into different subgroups that will remain fluid as they progress through the various programs' lessons including review of HMH lessons, Phonics, Vocabulary, Snap and Read and Read Works Cold Reads.

Person Responsible Montez Harmon (montez.harmon@wcsdschools.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.

The school will continue to monitor students' and staff mental health with a mental health counselor on campus full time. We recognize that behavior may sometimes be a way of communication so we will exhaust strategies and resources for resolutions.

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.

We work very hard to have a positive school culture. We encourage our teachers to build relationships with our students to provide a positive role model. Our guidance counselor reads positive statements and challenges to our students on the announcements each week. Our school resource officer helps our kindness initiative by rewarding students who were "caught" being good in the form of showing kindness around the school.

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

We have a small number of businesses in our local community that we are able to reach out to. We have several churches that partner with us. We value the relationships with our businesses and church community members. Parents and students are also encouraged to reach out to the school if they have any concerns. They are welcome to email, call, or come in person to have needs addressed. They are invited to our monthly PTO meetings as well as our SAC meetings. We seek their input as to how we can do things better at VES.