

Washington County School District

Vernon Middle 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Vernon Middle School

3190 MOSS HILL RD, Vernon, FL 32462

<http://vms.wcsdschools.com>

Demographics

Principal: Niki Seley

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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 (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (41%)
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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Vernon Middle School

3190 MOSS HILL RD, Vernon, FL 32462

<http://vms.wcsdschools.com>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>25%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

The mission of Vernon Middle School I is to INSPIRE all students to value learning, ENCOURAGE all students to develop ethical decision-making skills, EMPOWER all students to live productive and satisfying lives, and EDUCATE all students to the fullest level of their potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vernon Middle School will become a school of excellence.

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
Riviere, Brian	Principal	
Seley, Niki	Assistant Principal	
Coleman, Kathleen	School Counselor	
Brown, Kimberley	Instructional Coach	
Coleman, Rodgers	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/24/2021, Niki Seley

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

22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

283

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

2

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

2

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	91	98	0	0	0	0	283
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	19	19	0	0	0	0	57
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	6	5	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	21	39	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	27	36	0	0	0	0	83
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	21	39	0	0	0	0	74

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	5	9	10	0	0	0	0	24

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	4	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	0	0	0	0	14

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/27/2021

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	0	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	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	91	98	0	0	0	0	283
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	31	42	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	15	23	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	21	39	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	27	36	0	0	0	0	83

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	15	26	38	0	0	0	0	79

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	4	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	0	0	0	0	14

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				48%	52%	54%	44%	49%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	53%	54%	53%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	44%	47%	54%	51%	47%
Math Achievement				53%	57%	58%	53%	58%	58%
Math Learning Gains				53%	59%	57%	55%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	51%	51%	54%	54%	51%
Science Achievement				48%	49%	51%	35%	44%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				74%	75%	72%	66%	68%	72%

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
06	2021					
	2019	44%	52%	-8%	54%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	46%	47%	-1%	52%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
08	2021					
	2019	56%	55%	1%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	40%	55%	-15%	55%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	48%	57%	-9%	54%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
08	2021					
	2019	60%	39%	21%	46%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	48%	46%	2%	48%	0%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	72%	72%	0%	71%	1%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	95%	49%	46%	61%	34%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Students in grades 6, 7, and 8 are assessed for progress monitoring purposes using the APM (Adaptive Progress Monitoring tool) in math and ELA.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	-	
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	-	-	-

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

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	14	18	21	14	20	18	28	27			
BLK	26	24		26	26		22				
MUL	50	21		13	21						
WHT	35	30	18	37	32	28	39	54	47		
FRL	34	27	18	29	24	26	34	54	38		
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	18	24	23	23	44	44	26	50			
BLK	35	44	30	32	44	60	27				
MUL	38	31		50	25						
WHT	52	56	49	56	56	45	51	70	55		
FRL	45	50	42	50	50	41	49	68	67		

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	16	46	48	17	46	44	16	44			
BLK	29	48	58	31	52	42	21	55			
HSP	27	45		45	55						
MUL	50	50		70	50						
WHT	46	53	52	55	56	59	35	69	73		
FRL	43	54	59	51	50	48	38	62	63		

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	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	311
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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	25
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	26
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	36
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	32
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

We have several areas of concern including the following: the number of students scoring level 1 on statewide assessments for both Math and ELA, the low performance of the majority of our subgroups on the FPPI (African American, Hispanic, students with disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students), and students in the lower quartile. There are also concerns that the periods of time away from face to face learning and the Innovative Learning Environment, created by the COVID 19 pandemic, fostered learning gaps across all areas and subgroups.

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

ELA achievement and Math performed the lowest for assessments in 2021 and are in the greatest need of improvement. This has become a trend for lower performance when compared to District and State performance.

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

Math overall (Grades 6-8) proficiency shows a 37% gap as compared to the state average and ELA overall (Grades 6-8) proficiency shows a gap of 19%. Even with intensive supports and interventions in place during 2020-21 school year, we realize that more resources and interventions are needed for continued improvement. For the 2021-22 school year VMS has gone to a seven period day that allowed more intensive classes in math and reading be added to our master schedule. In addition to these intensive classes providing support to Level 1 and Level 2 learners VMS has also instituted an ELA focus approach that requires ELA teachers to meet with other content teachers at least once a month to collaborate on providing quality assessments that incorporate one or more ELA strategies on classroom assessments. VMS is also utilizing a math coach and academic analyst to assist math and reading teachers with recourses and one on one assistance to students during class. ESE support has increased in all content areas, Tier 3 students are provided interventions with System 44 through Read 180, and VMS offers after school tutoring with certified teachers.

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

State assessment data shows the component with the most improvement is (???) (from xx% to xx%). An action that VMS knew was necessary to achieve growth in (???) was the recruitment and retention of quality (xxx) teachers. Students prior to the 2018-2019 school year had numerous teachers, many of whom were not certified in science. Between each new teacher assignment, substitute teachers were assigned to the 8th-grade classroom.

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

Student Engagement and rigor in the classroom - teachers will continue to receive professional development on engagement strategies, utilizing Khan Academy and IXL, utilizing district pacing guides and learning progressions, and standards-based instruction.

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

1. Progress monitoring
2. Student engagement and rigor in the classroom
3. Utilize Khan Academy and IXL

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 for teachers may include college-level coursework, seminars, conferences, or online classes.

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

1. Progress monitoring
2. Utilize Khan Academy and IXL
3. Increase Students with Disabilities and ELL proficiency scores
4. Student engagement and rigor in the classroom
5. Increase acceleration data from an increased CTE rate and students earning credit in high school level courses
6. Remediation/Targeted Support- before and after school programs for math and ELA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus will emphasize improved instructional practices in writing in order to improve the 2021 ELA writing overall school wide ELA average. In 2020/2021 the school wide ELA score (6th-8th grade average) was 32% which is far below the state average of 6th grade through 8th grade of 51%. All three areas of writing will be emphasized with a focus on the third strand in the writing subcategory.

Measurable Outcome: This writing focus will result in an overall ELA proficiency of at least 15 percentage points in overall ELA scores. This increase will help to close the overall gap in the district ELA average of 44%.

Monitoring: All content areas will incorporate short and long response items on each classroom assessment as well as incorporating writing strategies on bell work and daily work assignments to be graded using a writing rubric.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kimberley Brown (kim.brown@wcsdschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Every test has a minimum of one written short response and one long response. These are scored with the FSA writing rubric to ensure fidelity AND feedback is given.
2. Include a reading passage related to your content area and have students apply what they read to an activity.
3. Have a written piece in the bell ringer.
4. Take Cornell Notes on a topic, then apply these to a Socratic Seminar, written response, reflection, essay, etc. The important piece is to APPLY them to something, not just have them take the notes and put them away.
5. Collaborate with an ELA teacher to assign an essay to your class that will be scored for CONTENT and for WRITING using the FSA rubric.
6. Use a CPALMS lesson or AVID WICOR lesson that relates to your curriculum and addresses the above standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies can be implemented in each content area in order to meet the measurable outcome.

Action Steps to Implement

ELA and Intensive Reading teachers will have monthly team meetings to share and discuss each strategy being used. They will collect work samples from other content area teachers to examine and evaluate for strategies used and to offer instructional coaching, if needed.

Person Responsible: Kimberley Brown (kim.brown@wcsdschools.com)

Core content areas will hold monthly meetings to share and discuss strategies used when incorporating these strategies on classroom exams.

Person Responsible: Kimberley Brown (kim.brown@wcsdschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus will improved instructional practices in all ELA content areas and Intensive Reading. In 2020/2021 the school wide ELA score (6th-8th grade average) was 32% which is far below the state average of 6th grade through 8th grade of 51%. All three areas of writing will be emphasized with a focus on the third strand in the writing subcategory.

Measurable Outcome: This ELA focus will result in an overall ELA proficiency of at least 15 percentage points in overall ELA scores. This increase will help to close the overall gap in the district ELA average of 44%. .

Monitoring: Across all ELA classes, APM progress monitoring and classroom assessments as will as lexile levels in intensive reading classes will be used to periodically to monitor progress in ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kimberley Brown (kim.brown@wcsdschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Read 180 and programs that come within this program will be used in Intensive Reading classes to improve scores in students who are not proficient in ELA, including the lower quartile of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This research based strategy was chosen district wide for use in the intensive reading classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

ELA and Intensive Reading teachers will have monthly team meetings to share and discuss each strategy being used, progress on APM, and overall classroom performance. They will collect work samples from other content area teachers to examine and evaluate for strategies used and to offer instructional coaching, if needed.

Person Responsible Kimberley Brown (kim.brown@wcsdschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus will emphasize improved instructional practices in mathematics in order to improve the 2021 overall school wide Math FSA average. In 2020/2021 the school wide math score (6th-8th grade average) was 25% proficiency which is far below the state average of 6th grade through 8th grade of 42%.
Measurable Outcome:	This math focus will result in an overall math proficiency increase of at least 15 percentage points in overall ELA scores. This increase will help to close the overall gap of the district and state math average of 42%.
Monitoring:	Across all math classes, APM progress monitoring and classroom assessments in regular math classes and intensive math classes. Students will be given assessments designed by a math coach/tutor in all intensive math classes to gage progress and to drive instruction. This monitoring coupled with APM will give teachers data needed to provide individualized instruction to improve individual scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberley Brown (kim.brown@wcsdschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Academic Analyst and Math Coach will provide teachers with interventions that meet Tier 2 and Tier 3 requirements in MTSS.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Individualized interventions and instruction are required for students in Tiers 2 and 3 and will be provided by Intensive Math teachers in an additional math period daily.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

- 1. Maintain at least 90% average daily attendance rate.**
- 2. Reduce the number of out of school suspension and number of In school suspension days by 20%.**
- 3. Increase by 2% the number of students that score on grade level and show one-year of growth on the FSA test.**
- 4. Increase by 1% the number of students that score on grade level and show one-year of growth in ELA/Math.**

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.

Research shows that students receive the following benefits from a collaborative partnership with the school, the family and the community: higher grades and test scores, better attendance and homework completion, fewer placements in special education, more positive attitudes and behavior, higher graduation rates and greater enrollment in post secondary education. The gain for families includes: improved understanding of their child’s development, improved ability to parent, improved ability to assist their children with school and learning, and improved relationships among all stakeholders.

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

Parents/families, school faculty representatives, and community members were involved in the development of a written Parent/Family Engagement Plan that has been adopted by the Washington County School District and approved by the local school advisory council.

One or more parents/families and teachers/staff from each representative school center (VMS and VHS) as well as the business community in the district have been involved in the planning and development of the Parent/Family Engagement Plan. Our School Advisory Council meetings will be held quarterly for the purpose of planning, implementing, and evaluating our plans and expected growth.

VMS builds positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by advertising and holding a beginning of the school year orientation / open house and parent nights throughout the school year to inform and update families. In addition, community pep rallies during VMS athletic events, community book fair held during Literacy Week, and continual use of social media will be used to inform and encourage all parties to be involved and supportive of our students. Phone links go out regularly to reach an even wider audience, since many of our families do not have internet access in the home.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
---	--------	---	--------

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