

Collier County Public Schools

# Vineyards Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

| Table of Contents              |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Demographics            | 3  |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

# Vineyards Elementary School

6225 ARBOR BLVD W, Naples, FL 34119

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Ed Laudice**

Start Date for this Principal: 1/13/2017

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 55%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: A (73%)<br>2018-19: A (68%)<br>2017-18: A (71%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   |  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

| Table of Contents              |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

## Vineyards Elementary School

6225 ARBOR BLVD W, Naples, FL 34119

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

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | No                     | 55%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 43%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A       |         | A       | A       |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier County School Board.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Vineyards Elementary School is committed to providing exceptional learning opportunities to motivate and engage all students.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The staff and students will obtain the tools necessary to become successful thinkers, problem solvers, decision makers and lifelong learners.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name               | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| Elgin, Georgie     | Principal           | The Principal will provide leadership and guidance to ensure the implementation of Multi-Tiered System of Supports with fidelity and also with providing resources and opportunities for staff development.  |
| Fisher, Tracy      | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal will provide leadership and guidance to ensure the implementation of Multi-Tiered System of Supports with fidelity and also with providing resources and opportunities for staff development.  |
| Kring, Robin       | Other               | The ESE Program Specialist will facilitate all school procedures, training and activities related to the student response to intervention and instruction. She will coordinate with the MTSS Leadership Team, the grade level teams, and parents in the problem solving process. The ESE Program Specialist will support planning and review of data collection. |
| Petry, Danielle    | Instructional Media | Provide support with the media center, small group intervention and media class time   |
| Savenas, Joy       | Other               | provide small group instruction and support to ELL students  |
| Yzaguirre, Cynthia | School Counselor    | The School Counselor will attend MTSS meetings as needed to support behavioral or social emotional concerns. She will provide support with matching interventions to student needs, in data collection, progress monitoring, and parent communication.   |
| Ruff, Melissa      | Reading Coach       | he Instructional Coach will attend MTSS meetings and help with identifying appropriate interventions and assessments. She will support teams in matching interventions to student needs, in data collection, and assist with professional learning.  |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Friday 1/13/2017, Ed Laudice

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

9

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

11

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

81

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

845

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

15

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

13

**Demographic Data****Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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                              | 124         | 111 | 145 | 143 | 133 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 801   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 10          | 16  | 14  | 8   | 6   | 11  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 65    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 2   | 3   | 5   | 10  | 4   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 10  | 11  | 11  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 4   | 2   | 7   | 1   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 3   | 10  | 15  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 9   | 10  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 12  | 17  | 16  | 14  | 15  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 74    |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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           | 6 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 9/12/2022

**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                              | 113         | 133 | 137 | 141 | 151 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 844   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 5           | 6   | 7   | 6   | 11  | 11  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 46    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 11  | 7   | 10  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 1   | 0   | 8   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 3   | 11  | 16  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 30    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 2   | 11  | 20  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| 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           | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |

**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           | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**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                              | 113         | 133 | 137 | 141 | 151 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 844   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 5           | 6   | 7   | 6   | 11  | 11  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 46    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 11  | 7   | 10  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 1   | 0   | 8   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 3   | 11  | 16  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 30    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 2   | 11  | 20  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| 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           | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |

#### 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           | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| 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).

| School Grade Component      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 76%    | 64%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 76%    | 60%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 75%    |          |       |        |          |       | 66%    | 59%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 58%    |          |       |        |          |       | 47%    | 51%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 83%    | 56%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 81%    | 68%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 80%    |          |       |        |          |       | 77%    | 64%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 70%    |          |       |        |          |       | 66%    | 55%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 71%    | 72%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 65%    | 59%      | 53%   |

### 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 |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 79%    | 61%      | 18%                        | 58%   | 21%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 80%    | 58%      | 22%                        | 58%   | 22%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -79%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 72%    | 60%      | 12%                        | 56%   | 16%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -80%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 82%    | 68%      | 14%                        | 62%   | 20%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 84%    | 65%      | 19%                        | 64%   | 20%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -82%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 78%    | 67%      | 11%                        | 60%   | 18%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -84%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 64%    | 56%      | 8%                         | 53%   | 11%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 28       | 49     | 44          | 39        | 73      | 71           | 16       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 47       | 59     | 55          | 62        | 66      | 50           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 79       | 73     |             | 93        | 82      |              | 70       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 59       | 41     |             | 68        | 82      |              | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 70       | 74     | 61          | 77        | 78      | 62           | 60       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 75       | 80     |             | 88        | 100     |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 81       | 79     | 66          | 86        | 80      | 72           | 78       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 64       | 72     | 60          | 68        | 76      | 63           | 61       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 35       | 65     | 60          | 34        | 37      | 21           | 35       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 56       | 58     |             | 75        | 84      |              | 67       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 83       |        |             | 100       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 76       |        |             | 67        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 69       | 54     | 38          | 78        | 72      | 53           | 66       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 63       |        |             | 69        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 83       | 81     | 64          | 84        | 73      | 53           | 85       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 64       | 51     | 41          | 72        | 70      | 53           | 74       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 28       | 40     | 42          | 38        | 58      | 63           | 19       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 67       | 58     |             | 78        | 76      | 60           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 70       |        |             | 100       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 59       | 50     |             | 64        | 75      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 68       | 59     | 33          | 76        | 70      | 53           | 49       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 71       |        |             | 79        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 83       | 71     | 77          | 85        | 82      | 76           | 81       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 62       | 63     | 38          | 73        | 74      | 62           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 72  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 59  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 572 |

| ESSA Federal Index   |      |
|--|------|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 8    |
| Percent Tested   | 100% |
| Subgroup Data  |      |
| Students With Disabilities   |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 48   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 0    |
| English Language Learners  |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 56   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| Native American Students   |      |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |      |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        | 0    |
| Asian Students   |      |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 79   |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0    |
| Black/African American Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 60   |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0    |
| Hispanic Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 68   |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0    |
| Multiracial Students   |      |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 86   |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO   |

| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0   |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 77  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 66  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### 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?

The trends show as a school we are making sufficient learning gains with our students however, the achievement levels do not show the same rate of growth. As a school we are focused on selecting evidence-based strategies that will impact the proficiency of each student in all content areas. Our students with disabilities subgroup continue to struggle more than the other subgroups. Professional development for our ESE inclusion staff will be provided for the instructional adjustments being made to improve the proficiency for these students.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data component demonstrating the greatest need for improvement was our Science Achievement score. There was a 7% decrease in our students' abilities to score at the proficient level in science.

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

Contributing factors for this area of improvement includes specific student data within our SWD and ELL subgroups. Students continue to struggle with the understanding of content vocabulary and the standards in the area of science. With a 7% decrease in our students' abilities to score at the proficient

level in science, we will utilize the 5E instructional model to ensure students are provided the opportunities to engage, explore, explain, elaborate, and evaluate science content.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

The data component showing the most improvement was the math learning gains for the lowest 25%.

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

One of the school improvement goals last year focused on the learning gains of all students in math. Contributing factors for this improvement included specific focus in collaborative planning on possible misconceptions by students and how to address them in the lessons, students get individual goals for each unit, frequent review and celebration on the goals, utilized District resources to provide intervention, reinforcement and enrichment for each unit for spiral review. The staff began each planning session with a review of common misconceptions for the learning standards in each unit. The staff planned for explicit instruction and intervention to ensure students were building procedural fluency from concept understanding.

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

The implementation of tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving will be utilized to ensure student learning is accelerated as well as increase the math proficiency for all students in the area of mathematics.

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

Professional development will include analysis of the new B.E.S.T standards in Math. The staff will be trained on how to effectively plan for a math lesson using guided and activity-based explorations as well as how to implement tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving.

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

Additional professional development for ESE inclusion teachers and ELL immersion teacher on the B.E.S.T standards in Math and the implementation of tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

SY22 student performance in ELA indicates a decrease and trending in the mid 70s. Observational data and assessment data indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction on how to think about content, process content and reflect on learning.

**Measurable Outcome:**  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

When teachers deliver standards-based instruction that utilizes concept maps, the proficiency of the students on the Spring 2023 ELA Statewide Assessment will increase 4 percentage points, from 76% to 80%.

**Monitoring:**  
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Observation of instructional planning, delivery of instruction and review of lesson plans will be monitored by administration. Feedback will be provided to the instructional staff specific to the implementation of concept maps.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Georgie Elgin (elginge@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

The VES staff will utilize concept maps to promote improvement in this area of focus. The strategy will include visual organizers to enrich students' understanding of the new concept.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Students will be able to actively process new content through the use of concept map that include multiple ways for students to think about content, revise knowledge, and reflect on learning.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

All instructional staff will participate in professional development on the how to help students process new content using concept maps.

**Person Responsible**

Georgie Elgin (elginge@collierschools.com)

Teachers will engage in a standards-aligned, collaborative planning that incorporates the use of concept maps in the ELA lessons.

**Person Responsible**

Georgie Elgin (elginge@collierschools.com)

Teachers will implement weekly lesson plans with fidelity.

**Person Responsible**

Georgie Elgin (elginge@collierschools.com)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

SY22 student performance in fifth grade science indicated a downward trend in proficiency, particularly related to life science.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

When teachers deliver standards-based instruction that utilizes the 5E model and District resources, fifth grade proficiency on the Spring 2023 Statewide Science Assessment will increase 9 percentage points, from 71% to 80%.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Instructional planning, observation of instruction and lesson plans will be monitored by administration. Feedback will be provided to the instructional staff specific to the implementation of the 5E instructional model.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Georgie Elgin (elginge@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

The use of the 5E instructional model will be implemented at VES to promote improvement in this area of focus. The 5E instructional model is a research-based approach to designing instructional sequences with a unit where each phase (engage, explore, explain, elaborate, and evaluate) is used as the basis for one or more lessons.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

The use of the 5E instructional model will guide teachers through a planning process to ensure the students are engaged in the scientific process to clearly understand the new content.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will engage in standards-aligned, collaborative planning that incorporates the 5E instructional model.

**Person Responsible**

Georgie Elgin (elginge@collierschools.com)

Fifth grade teachers will participate in professional development on the 5E model for high quality, standards-aligned science instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Georgie Elgin (elginge@collierschools.com)

Teachers will implement weekly lesson plans with fidelity.

**Person Responsible**

Georgie Elgin (elginge@collierschools.com)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus Description****and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

SY22 student performance in Mathematics indicates a slight increase in math proficiency. Observational data and assessment data indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction on how to complete tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

When teachers deliver standards-based instruction that implements tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving, the proficiency of the students on the Spring 2023 Mathematics Statewide Assessment will increase 3 percentage points, from 83% to 86%.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Observation of instructional planning, delivery of instruction and review of lesson plans will be monitored by administration. Feedback will be provided to the instructional staff specific to the implementation of tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tracy Fisher (fishet@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Implementing tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving will engage students in solving and discussing mathematical tasks allowing multiple entry points and varied solution strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Students will effectively complete tasks that create a productive struggle, requiring them to make sense of the tasks by drawing on and making connections with their prior understanding and ideas. It is important for the students to persevere in explorations and reasoning when solving mathematical tasks.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will engage in standards-aligned, collaborative planning that incorporates the implementation of tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving.

**Person Responsible**

Tracy Fisher (fishet@collierschools.com)

Teachers will participate in professional development on how to plan for tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving for high quality, standards-aligned mathematics instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Tracy Fisher (fishet@collierschools.com)

Teachers will implement weekly lesson plans with fidelity.

**Person Responsible**

Tracy Fisher (fishet@collierschools.com)

## **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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

### **Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

At Vineyards Elementary all stakeholders share the belief that all students can and will succeed. We believe in establishing strong working relationships between parents, community partners, students, and staff with a shared vision of effective communication, teamwork, and high expectations to ensure great teaching and learning. We focus on the implementation of strategies and activities that foster a sense of belonging for students. Vineyards Elementary has Buddy Benches in our recess area, school wide Connect for Success lessons focused on the 7 Habits, a Handle with Care notification process, Leader in Me initiatives, implementation of PBIS, and student recognition announcements.

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

We have special positions on our staff to support our sense of belonging initiatives such as the Wellness Coach and Connection Coach. Our PTO and SAC committee members also play a role in promoting a positive school culture and environment. Specific events held throughout the year include VES Family Winter Festival, VES Family Sun-n-Fun Night, Teacher Meet & Greet, Curriculum Nights, teacher recognition announcements and teacher appreciation events.