Manatee County Public Schools

Visible Men Academy



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| 3 |
|----|
| |
| 4 |
| |
| 6 |
| |
| 9 |
| |
| 16 |
| 19 |
| 19 |
| 19 |
| |

Visible Men Academy

921 63RD AVE E, Bradenton, FL 34203

http://www.vmacademy.org

Demographics

Principal: Janjay Gehndyu

Start Date for this Principal: 9/18/2021

| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
|---|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-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) | English Language Learners Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: C (49%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) In | formation* |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| 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 Manatee 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:

- 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 | 19 |

Visible Men Academy

921 63RD AVE E, Bradenton, FL 34203

http://www.vmacademy.org

School Demographics

| School Type and Gi (per MSID I | | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvan | I Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|--|
| Elementary S KG-5 | School | Yes | | 100% |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E | ducation | Yes | | 80% |
| School Grades Histo | ry | | | |
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| Grade | | В | В | Α |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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 VMA is to provide boys with outstanding academic, character, and social education in a nurturing school environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The VMA vision is to lead boys toward a realization of their innate strong character – boys who are family oriented, community conscious, and globally aware. Through a firm foundation of intellectual and academic diligence, VMA students are equipped to meet and exceed the expectations of challenging middle and high school environments and are eager and determined to pursue college education. Through the rigorous modeling experience of the Visible Men Success Curriculum, VMA students gain vast exposure to future personal and career possibilities. These combine to cultivate within VMA students an unyielding sense of control over their futures – a critical orientation for lifelong success, personal fulfillment, and family and community contribution.

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 |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Gehndyu, Janjay | Principal | Will develop and design new academic programs using student FSA data. |
| Velasco, Diego | Dean | |
| Gehndyu , Jackie | Other | Oversee all special education students and services including those with IEP's, 504 plans, gifted, and english language learners. Will also provide student intervention and RTI support for low performing students. |
| Hinds , Jacqueline | Curriculum Resource Teacher | Will ensure all academic programs and initiates & delivery methods are met. |
| Parker , Louis | Other | Will oversee implementation and design of academic programs. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 9/18/2021, Janjay Gehndyu

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.

1

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

7

Total number of students enrolled at the school

75

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 |
|--|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Number of students enrolled | 11 | 9 | 9 | 18 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|-----------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| illuicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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

Friday 8/27/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 11 | 12 | 13 | 17 | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 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 | | | |

2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 11 | 12 | 13 | 17 | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| | 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 | |
|----------|-----------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students | with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| indicator | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 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 | |

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).

| Sahaal Crada Campanant | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | 2018 | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State | |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 40% | 52% | 57% | 46% | 50% | 56% | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 53% | 57% | 58% | 73% | 54% | 55% | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 55% | 53% | | 47% | 48% | |
| Math Achievement | | | | 54% | 63% | 63% | 66% | 60% | 62% | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 68% | 68% | 62% | 74% | 61% | 59% | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 60% | 53% | 51% | | 47% | 47% | |
| Science Achievement | | | | 47% | 48% | 53% | | 49% | 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 | 24% | 51% | -27% | 58% | -34% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 32% | 56% | -24% | 58% | -26% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -24% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 52% | 7% | 56% | 3% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -32% | | | • | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 60% | -25% | 62% | -27% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 65% | -18% | 64% | -17% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -35% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 71% | 60% | 11% | 60% | 11% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -47% | | | | |

| | | | SCIEN | CE | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 48% | -1% | 53% | -6% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

I-Ready grades K-5 Reading Mastery grades 3-5

| | | Grade 1 | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| | | Grade 2 | | |
|--------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | English Language Learners | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | English Language Learners | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| | | Grade 3 | | |
| | Number/% | F. II | Winter | 0 : |
| | Proficiency | Fall | VVIIILEI | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | 18 | 18 | Spring 18 |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With | 18 100% | 18 100% | 18 100% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | 18 100% 5 | 18 100% 5 | 18 100% 5 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | 18 100% 5 1 | 18 100% 5 1 | 18 100% 5 1 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | 18 100% 5 1 Fall | 18 100% 5 1 Winter | 18 100% 5 1 Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | 18 100% 5 1 Fall 18 | 18 100% 5 1 Winter 18 | 18 100% 5 1 Spring 18 |

| | | Grade 4 | | |
|--------------------------|---|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | Students With Disabilities English Language | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | Learners | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | English Language Learners | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | | Grade 5 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| | English Language Learners | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| | English Language Learners | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| | English Language Learners | 6 | 6 | 6 |

Subgroup Data Review

| | | 2021 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 |
| ELL | 27 | | | 36 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | 7 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 21 | | | 33 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 19 | 38 | | 30 | 21 | | 8 | | | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMP | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 10 | | | 20 | 50 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 58 | | 71 | 69 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 41 | | 40 | 65 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 45 | 53 | | 68 | 75 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 48 | | 49 | 66 | 60 | 43 | | | | |
| | | 2018 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 |
| ELL | 50 | | | 76 | 90 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 83 | | 53 | 58 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 73 | | 83 | 92 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 76 | | 63 | 73 | | | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities

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

| This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021. | This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as or 10/19/2021. | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ESSA Federal Index | | | | | | | |
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | | | | | | | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 25 | | | | | | |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES | | | | | | |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 | | | | | | |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 40 | | | | | | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 149 | | | | | | |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 | | | | | | |
| Percent Tested | 95% | | | | | | |
| Subgroup Data | | | | | | | |
| Students With Disabilities | | | | | | | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|--------|
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 34 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 4 |
| 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 | 27 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| | N/A |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | 14// \ |

| White Students | | |
|---|-----|--|
| Federal Index - White Students | | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A | |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 23 |
| 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?

Our students have trouble with reading.

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

ELA scores

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

We need consistent intense remediation, direct instruction, research based curriculum and positive attendance from our families and students.

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

There was no improvement

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

N/A

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

Remediation groups, direct instruction, qualified teachers, and research based curriculum.

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.

Curriculum training has been provided and teachers will be required to attend district provided inservices.

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

Teachers will continue to receive training on providing direct instruction to students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Students with disabilities

Area of

Focus

Our students with disabilities need to improve more with academics. The Federal Index -

Description and

Students With Disabilities was below 40%.

Rationale:

Measurable

Students with disabilities will improve their reading abilities to at least 40% according to the

Outcome: Federal Index score.

Monitoring: Students will be monitored according to the FSA and iReady tests.

Person responsible

for

Jackie Gehndyu (jgehndyu@vmacademy.org)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased Students with disabilities are receiving researched based remediation tools (Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading program) every day for 40 minutes per day, provided by a certified teacher. Our school also has an ESE teacher and Resource room teacher who are

available to assist those students in need.

Rationale

Strategy:

for Evidence-

Reading Mastery/Corrective Reading is a data proven program that uses direct instruction to help struggling readers. When used in 2017, we saw our students grow tremendously in

based their reading abilities.

Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

Students are grouped according to their reading levels. Students are then placed into an appropriate reading remediation small group. Each small group is led by a certified teacher. The ESE teacher and Resource room teacher consistently monitor and discuss the students progress monitoring data. Adjustments are made accordingly.

Person Responsible

Jackie Gehndyu (jgehndyu@vmacademy.org)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Elementary students in grades K - 2 participate in the EarlyBird Educational Program that is a comprehensive assessment to assist in identifying reading issues early in order to connect teachers to the interventions that are effective. The students we serve typically enter their school year with gaps and this tool helps them early in their learning to bridge their learning gaps before testing grades and beyond.

Measurable Outcome:

The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is that 65 - 70% of our students will be on grade level by the end of Kindergarten into First grade based on the growth students achieved using the EarlyBird Assessment tool from the 2019 - 2020 school year.

This area of focus is monitored and followed beginning in Kindergarten through 2nd grade in quarterly increment assessments using the EarlyBird tool. The tool is an algorithm that measures percentiles across national sources of students that are the same age and grade. Outcomes of our students are compared within and across grade levels to use data informed instruction in the classroom and intensive intervention with the ESE teacher and Resource teacher. Students are also further tested for dyslexia if they are showing dyslexic tendencies according to the data collected.

Person responsible

Monitoring:

for monitoring outcome:

Evidence-

Strategy:

based

Jacqueline Hinds (jhinds@vmacademy.org)

A comprehensive assessment is given that is given in critical foundational skill areas scientifically proven to be predictive of reading ability. Those areas tested are: phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, rapid naming, following directions, and other reading competencies. The support curriculum used in intervention and in the classroom is the Wilson Language Fundations for the implementation of an MTSS or RTI framework. Progress monitoring is built into Fundations for a more intensive program to be identified early before undergoing years of struggle.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: The program was developed by Boston Children's Hospital and the Florida Center for Reading Research as a quick comprehensive assessment to identify struggling readers and readers with dyslexic tendencies early. It is researched based and saves time for teachers of giving multiple assessments. The Wilsons Language Fundations curriculum is also researched based and supports the intervention as a multisensory structured language program used for Tier 1 and Tier 2 intervention for students.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Students will be assessed for reading gaps in EarlyBird Education Tool
- 2. Teachers will implement the Wilsons Language Fundations in their classrooms and reading intervention will occur
- 3. Students will be reassessed and progress monitored for growth or gaps
- 4. Students are followed from grade Kindergarten through Second grade to continue RTI as needed

Person Responsible

Jacqueline Hinds (jhinds@vmacademy.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

School culture and environment will be monitored through our allotted time for mindfulness and participation in school activities. We have also created small instructional groups, where designated staff members can monitor a small group of students and report back to administration.

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 address building a positive school culture and environment through character development. We encourage team work and project based learning through Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics.

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

Key Stake holders are the Early Learning Coalition, Funducation, and Florida Studio theatre.

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Students with disabilities | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|---|--------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Select below: | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| | | Total: | \$0.00 |