Viera Charter School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Viera Charter School

6206 BRESLAY DR, Viera, FL 32940

www.vieracharterschool.com

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Viera Charter School is to provide students with a challenging program which emphasizes scientific inquiry, critical thinking, understanding of mathematical concepts and effective communication using innovative reform-based instructional methods in a stimulating and nurturing environment that fosters maximum student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Viera Charter School recognizes that all children are unique; that each learns in a different style and at a different pace. We strive to meet the individual needs of every student through a variety of programs and differentiated instructional techniques designed to prepare the child for success.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cady, Julie	Principal	Dr. Cady is responsible for continuous improvement, efficacy of instruction, monitoring and/or evaluation of personnel, providing feedback to all personnel, budgeting, monitoring and supervision of instructional program. She collaborates with the governing board, the management company (CSA), community stakeholders and the school leadership team to provide a vision for school success. She also provides guidance and direction to administrators and teachers. She identifies areas of focus, sets goals and determines responsibilities in all areas pertaining to VCS. The principal oversees the operation of the entire school and monitors performance of school administrators, teacher leaders and the staff as a whole.
Spadaccini, Lynn	Assistant Principal	Dr. Spadaccini is responsible for the SIP,, the VCS Reading Plan, and the Title II and Title IV Plans. She communicates to the leadership team, the bookkeeper, team leaders and individual teachers regarding responsibilities involved with each of these plans. She evaluates staff and provides guidance relative to instruction and school improvement practices. She additionally is responsible for compliance with Student Progression policies, professional development, Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Program, the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS), and monitoring student academic progress. The assistant principal serves as the District Coordinator for the school's AVID program. All of these responsibilities contribute to the success of our student achievement goals.
Mills, Julie	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Mills attends all meetings regarding FAST and STAR (state assessment) in order to disseminate information to VCS Staff. She plans for efficient administration of state assessments and communicates to all stakeholders about the process as well as assessment results. She implements required assessment administration according to district and state guidance. She evaluates staff and provides guidance relative to instruction and school improvement practices. This assistant principal creates and oversees the supervision schedule. She additionally is responsible for compliance with school discipline policies. All of these responsibilities contribute to the success of our student achievement goals.
Goizueta, Chenistique	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Goizueta attends all PTSO meetings in order to collaborate with stakeholders outside of the school. She is responsible for communication to the leadership team and team leaders and individual teachers. She evaluates staff and provides guidance relative to instruction and school improvement practices. She additionally is responsible for compliance with state SESIR documentation. All of these responsibilities contribute to the success of our student achievement goals. This assistant principal oversees parent communication, registration, student placement and school schedules. She is the Title IX representative for VCS.
Finnell, Robyn	Dean	Mrs. Finnell is an integral part of the teacher/student/parent/guardian support team. She collaborates with teachers and assists with instructional practices: helps teachers analyze data, facilitates data chats, models instructional

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		practices to improve instruction and classroom management, she completes walkthroughs and gives formative feedback to teachers. She orders instructional materials and is the iReady Coordinator at our school and ensures teachers and students have access to the program, understands how to use the program and how to use data from the program reports. Mrs. Finnell oversees the ESOL program as well as the MTSS process for student behavior.
Hoffman, Suzanne	Dean	Mrs. Hoffman is an integral part of the teacher/student/parent/guardian support team. She collaborates with teachers and assists with instructional practices: helps teachers analyze data, models instructional practices to improve instruction and classroom management, she completes walkthroughs and gives formative feedback to teachers. She is the AVID Coordinator at our school and ensures teachers and students have access to the AVID resources, understands how to implement AVID strategies. The dean oversees the beginning teacher program at our school and manages the MTSS process for student behavior.
Rooney, Timothy	Dean	Mr. Rooney is responsible for facilities and for athletics. He serves as a member of the Threat Assessment Team and helps resolve issues related to threats. Mr. Rooney assists with discipline in the elementary grade levels. He evaluates staff and provides guidance relative to instruction and school improvement practices.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Advisory Council (SAC) is made up of the principal, a teacher, parents, business owners and students. Student achievement data are shared with SAC members so they can have meaningful involvement in developing the final SIP plan. A draft is presented to the SAC and input is taken at that time. Each person on the SAC is given a copy of the draft and is offered the ability to provide input after the meeting if they wish.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Achievement data are shared with the governing board, the SAC and the school faculty. Teachers are given data for the individual students in their classroom. Administrators will alert teachers that teachers in ALL classrooms will focus on students who fall into the bottom quartile of student performance for the class. The coaches, with support from an administrator, will hold quarterly data chats with teachers to

help identify the lowest quartile, set goals for these students, and to offer support and resources. After each data chat, students who previously fell into the bottom quartile will be evaluated to determine if they still fall into the bottom quartile, or if they have had enough growth to be replaced by a student who needs more support. We will continue this process throughout each quarter.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	25%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	24	17	27	11	12	18	10	15	12	146
One or more suspensions	4	14	8	8	5	12	7	8	9	75
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	12	17	11	21	15	80
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	8	9	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	4

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	18	14	17	11	9	15	13	21	22	140
One or more suspensions	7	4	4	11	4	9	16	15	27	97
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	6	3	13	19	17	63
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	15	4	12	9	6	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	18	14	17	11	9	15	13	21	22	140
One or more suspensions	7	4	4	11	4	9	16	15	27	97
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	6	3	13	19	17	63
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	15	4	12	9	6	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	70	58	53	75	63	55	73		
ELA Learning Gains				59			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			42		
Math Achievement*	78	62	55	81	40	42	75		
Math Learning Gains				72			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			47		
Science Achievement*	69	61	52	66	64	54	68		
Social Studies Achievement*	87	72	68	94	61	59	89		
Middle School Acceleration	71	70	70	57	51	51	57		
Graduation Rate		87	74		62	50			
College and Career Acceleration		75	53		76	70			
ELP Progress	71	47	55		68	70	64		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	518
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	621
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	57			
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	56			
HSP	69			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	57			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	48			
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	52			
HSP	70			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	57			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	70			78			69	87	71			71
SWD	46			64			43	79			5	
ELL	55			70							3	71
AMI												
ASN	86			96			64				3	
BLK	64			61			42				4	
HSP	68			75			65	89	52		6	
MUL	73			73			57	75	62		6	
PAC												
WHT	70			80			75	87	77		6	
FRL	51			63			51	79	44		6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	75	59	52	81	72	65	66	94	57			
SWD	36	46	39	50	53	50	46	65				
ELL	63	35		67	70							
AMI												
ASN	85	59		100	89							
BLK	52	42	33	61	60	63	23	82				
HSP	72	53	53	86	68	79	61	93	64			
MUL	72	55	55	80	79	72	76	100	42			
PAC												
WHT	78	62	56	82	72	62	69	95	58			
FRL	67	56	51	68	60	51	47	74	35			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	73	64	42	75	61	47	68	89	57			64
SWD	38	50	43	36	34	30	18	63				
ELL	63	68		72	76	92		86				64
AMI												
ASN	86	75		96	67							
BLK	54	52	25	43	39	40	53	67				
HSP	76	66	61	71	62	57	68	93	54			
MUL	74	73	46	79	51	27	55	93	50			
PAC												
WHT	74	64	42	77	64	48	69	90	59			
FRL	61	57	47	61	55	54	50	88	33			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	75%	59%	16%	54%	21%
07	2023 - Spring	73%	53%	20%	47%	26%
08	2023 - Spring	67%	52%	15%	47%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
06	2023 - Spring	68%	61%	7%	47%	21%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	56%	13%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	77%	67%	10%	54%	23%
07	2023 - Spring	86%	58%	28%	48%	38%
03	2023 - Spring	83%	60%	23%	59%	24%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	61%	10%	61%	10%
08	2023 - Spring	82%	38%	44%	55%	27%
05	2023 - Spring	80%	55%	25%	55%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	53%	48%	5%	44%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	74%	57%	17%	51%	23%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	51%	37%	50%	38%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	50%	50%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	61%	39%	63%	37%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	69%	17%	66%	20%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The FAST Reading test for middle school students showed the lowest performance. In 2023 68% of students who were in sixth grade were proficient in reading, compared to 80% of the same students (when in 5th grade) in 2022. In 2023 73% of students who were in seventh grade were proficient in reading, compared to 75% of the same students (when in 6th grade) in 2022. In 2023 66% of students who were in eighth grade were proficient in reading, compared to 72% of the same students (when in 7th grade) in 2022. Viera Charter School (VCS) performed above the state and district levels in each component indicated above. We contribute the change in scores to the change in the state assessment from the FSA ELA to FAST Reading.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

In 2023 68% of students who were in sixth grade were proficient in reading, compared to 80% of the same students (when in 5th grade) in 2022. Sixty percent of the sixth graders at the district level were proficient, while only 47% were proficient across the state. Aside from the fact that the test changed, the sixth grade VCS ELA teacher had excessive absences, which was a contributing factor to the drop in performance.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The largest gaps in performance compared to the state and district are the performances in Biology, Algebra and Geometry. All students at VCS, 100%, passed the Biology and Geometry EOC. At the state level 63% of Florida were proficient in Biology, while only 62% of the students in Brevard Public Schools were proficient. At the state level 48% of Florida students were proficient in Geometry while only 50% of the students in Brevard Public Schools were proficient. Eighty-four percent of VCS students passed the Algebra EOC. At the state level 50% of Florida students were proficient in Algebra, while only 51% of the students in Brevard Public Schools were proficient. In 2023 68% of students who were in sixth grade were proficient on the FAST reading. Sixty percent of the sixth graders at the district level were proficient, while only 47% across the state. The EOCs did not change, so the gap in

performance can be contributed to the screening process used to identify students for these courses, as well as our highly qualified staff who teach that content. Aside from the fact that the test changed, the sixth grade VCS ELA teacher had excessive absences, which was a contributing factor to the drop in performance.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

In 2022, 77% of VCS students were proficient in 7th grade mathematics, compared to 88% in 2023. We reduced the class size in our mathematics classes and scheduled struggling students into Intensive Mathematics courses.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The biggest area of concern according to our EWS data is the number of students who miss 10% or more of the school year.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

The highest priority for VCS is increasing the number of middle school students who are proficient in reading and language arts.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Positive culture and environment is a crucial need as determined by a review of the attendance data. Some of these data include student absences due to behavior issues.

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

VCS wants to reduce the number of student unexcused absences and school suspensions by 10%.

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

Attendance is monitored daily. The attendance clerk will identify students with excessive unexcused absences and report them to the assistant principal. Additionally, the two deans will monitor the number of absences due to suspension from school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lynn Spadaccini (lspadaccini@vieracharterschool.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

At the elementary level VCS will implement SEL curriculum, Caring School Community (CSC), which will address many of the classroom behaviors we see at the elementary level. At the middle school level, we have created classroom expectations for students in grades 6-8. Teachers, administrators and new hall monitors will model these expectations for students through daily discussions and grade level assemblies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

CSC meets the CASEL framework which helps cultivate environments, skills and relationships that enhance elementary students' social, emotional and academic learning. Having a common set of clear expectations will allow middle school students to know what they are expected to do and will let them know what they can expect from school staff.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Purchase Caring School Curriculum;

Person Responsible: Lynn Spadaccini (lspadaccini@vieracharterschool.com)

By When: June 2023

Train teachers on how to implement the CSC curriculum;

Person Responsible: Lynn Spadaccini (lspadaccini@vieracharterschool.com)

By When: August 2023

Discuss expectations for use of CSC curriculum;

Person Responsible: Julie Cady (jcady@vieracharterschool.com)

By When: August 2023

Monitor use and give feedback to teachers

Person Responsible: Lynn Spadaccini (lspadaccini@vieracharterschool.com)

By When: August - December 2023

Analyze Data

Person Responsible: Robyn Finnell (rfinnell@charterk12.com)

By When: May 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The 6th grade is primarily deficient in vocabulary. The 7th and 8th grades need to continue explicit vocabulary instruction. Their primary deficit at this time is in Informational Text. Vocabulary acquisition will aide them in this area, as will increased fluency.

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

By May 2024, 75% of middle school students will be proficient in ELA.

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

Progress will be monitored using FAST - ELA results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Mills (jmills@vieracharterschool.com)

Evidence-based Intervention: Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students in grades 6th - 8th will receive explicit vocabulary instruction in all core subjects.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the National Reading Panel (2000), explicit instruction of vocabulary is highly effective. To develop vocabulary intentionally, students should be explicitly taught both specific words and word-learning strategies.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention (Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Discuss expectation of teaching vocabulary explicitly.

Person Responsible: Chenistique Goizueta (cgoizueta@charter12.com)

By When: October 2023

Training for teachers on strategies on how to teach vocabulary explicitly.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Hoffman (shoffman@charterk12.com)

By When: October 2023

Conduct walkthroughs to observe vocabulary instruction

Person Responsible: Chenistique Goizueta (cgoizueta@charter12.com)

By When: November 2023 through April 2024