

Collier County Public Schools

Veterans Memorial Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Veterans Memorial Elementary School

15960 VETERANS MEMORIAL BLVD, Naples, FL 34110

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Vieira

Start Date for this Principal: 7/8/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (70%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 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.

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

Developing tomorrow's leaders today.

Provide the school's vision statement

To create a learning community, committed to high quality teaching and learning to support the success of every student, teacher, and staff member in reaching high standards of performance.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vieira, Jessica	Principal	Provides leadership in developing, coordinating, implementing, and evaluating school instructional and extra-curricular programs. Creates a positive school climate and a culture of character within the school. Organizes and provides staff development opportunities for all members of the school community. Facilitates parent involvement in the school community. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. Supports District and school SEL initiatives.
Hudson, Heidi	Instructional Coach	Supports all instructional staff with English Language Arts instruction, analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making.
Badiu, Jocelyn	Other	Supports MTSS school procedures, professional learning and activities regarding student academic and behavioral achievement, and student intervention in an efficient, professional manner. Works collaboratively with our school-based leadership team to monitor fidelity of MTSS implementation. Maintains a working knowledge of local, state, and federal laws and regulations related to compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as well as guidelines pertaining to eligibility, delivery of services, and individualized plan development. Additionally, facilitates gifted education eligibility and education plans for gifted students.
Ruben, Andrew	Guidance Counselor	Assists the Principal in maintaining a positive school climate and culture of character with the school. Serves as on-staff resource with expertise in student services. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. Supports District and school SEL initiatives.
Castro-Curet, Niurka	Other	Supports teachers of English Language Learners with instruction, analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Eaton, Kriste	Assistant Principal	Manages school operations in the absence of the Principal. Provides leadership to teachers and team leaders concerning instructional programs. Assists the Principal in the supervision of all school programs. Is a member of the Leadership and the Literacy Leadership Team and works to create literacy leaders within the school, strives to acquire knowledge in the area of literacy, supports and guides teams for ongoing collaboration. Seeks input from stakeholders before making decisions and works collaboratively with school staff. Supports District and school SEL initiatives.
Smith, Carrie	Instructional Media	Supports instructional staff with multimedia services, analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/8/2020, Jessica Vieira

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.*

7

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%

<p>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)</p>	<p>Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students</p>
<p>School Grades History</p>	<p>2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (70%)</p>
<p>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</p>	
<p>SI Region</p>	<p>Southwest</p>
<p>Regional Executive Director</p>	<p>Lucinda Thompson</p>
<p>Turnaround Option/Cycle</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Year</p>	<p></p>
<p>Support Tier</p>	<p></p>
<p>ESSA Status</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.</p>	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	120	143	122	131	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	745
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	3	6	2	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/23/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	114	133	121	133	148	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	761
Attendance below 90 percent	4	5	3	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2	5	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	114	133	121	133	148	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	761
Attendance below 90 percent	4	5	3	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2	5	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	82%	60%	57%	76%	61%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	75%	59%	58%	63%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	51%	53%	48%	54%	48%
Math Achievement	84%	68%	63%	84%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains	64%	64%	62%	61%	65%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	55%	51%	64%	55%	47%
Science Achievement	77%	59%	53%	73%	60%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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	2019	85%	61%	24%	58%	27%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	58%	20%	58%	20%
	2018	77%	60%	17%	56%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	81%	60%	21%	56%	25%
	2018	77%	59%	18%	55%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	90%	68%	22%	62%	28%
	2018	87%	67%	20%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	65%	11%	64%	12%
	2018	80%	67%	13%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	82%	67%	15%	60%	22%
	2018	82%	68%	14%	61%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	76%	56%	20%	53%	23%
	2018	71%	58%	13%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	62	67	65	64	63	58	43				
ELL	67	62	50	61	59	52	38				
BLK	63	64	50	67	64						
HSP	74	70	52	71	50	48	56				
MUL	80			87							
WHT	88	78	75	90	68	41	87				
FRL	73	65	53	70	51	53	58				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	52	50	31	60	46	57	44				
ELL	44	61	53	58	66	68					
BLK	41	40		65	56						
HSP	61	52	43	69	58	61	54				
MUL	87	70		87	30						
WHT	84	69	62	91	63	71	80				
FRL	64	54	43	74	62	62	51				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	70
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	558
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	60
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	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	62
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	61
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	84
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	75
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	61
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Lowest 25% learning gains for math showed the lowest performance, this is not a trend when looking at prior year data. A factor in this low performance is our 4th grade SWD lowest 25% students. Nineteen percent of the Lowest 25% are students with disabilities, of that 19% only 12.5% made learning gains. This is compared to 64.7% of our Lowest 25% who are not students with disabilities. This does not appear to be a trend as in the 2 previous years our students with disabilities who were in the lowest 25% in fourth and fifth grade outperformed the non-students with disabilities.

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

Lowest 25% learning gains for math has the greatest gap. There are no trends found in the data to indicate an explanation for this decline.

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

Lowest 25% learning gains for math has the greatest gap.

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

ELA Learning Gains and ELA Lowest 25% gains both had a 12% improvement. A new action included a school-wide intervention enrichment time.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Students with attendance below 90% and the number of suspensions.

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

1. Increasing Math Learning Gains for Lowest 25%
2. Maintain growth and gains for higher performing students
3. Maintain and increase ELA proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing Lowest 25% Math Learning Gains VME has a decrease of 15% in L25% Learning Gains in Math for FY19. All students will continue to make gains in math to work towards or maintain proficiency and beyond.
Measureable Outcome:	All students, including the subgroup of L25% will increase by 3% or the 20-21 school year by focusing on differentiation and small group targeted instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Vieira (vieiraje@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Flexible grouping and small group instruction focusing on foundational and sub-skills specific to student needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will benefit from small group instruction and ample opportunities to practice in order to become proficient in the identified skills. The small group instruction will be based on formative, classroom, district and state assessment data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monthly PLC Data Chats to monitor student progress through tiered intervention/MTSS
2. School-wide intervention 4 days per week to include math for the L25%
3. Morning Math Clubs for L25% focusing on specific needs of students.
4. Analysis and adjustments based on weekly district made formative assessments and quarterly district benchmark assessments.
5. Walkthroughs/observations during math instruction and planning to provide specific feedback.
6. Monthly math vertical articulation meetings.
7. Strategic scheduling - schedule ESE teachers into ESE clustered classes

Person Responsible Kriste Eaton (eatonk@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: VME increased the percent of students proficient in ELA by 6% in FY19.

Measureable Outcome: VME will continue to increase the percent of students proficient in ELA by at least 3% in FY 21 by focusing on standards-based planning and monitoring student performance utilizing district formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Vieira (vieiraje@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Flexible grouping and targeted instruction during school-wide intervention and enrichment times based on student-specific areas of strengths and needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students will need focused and targeted instruction as an intervention or enrichment for identified skills based on formative classroom,district and state assessment data.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1.Monthly PLC Data Chats to monitor student progress through tiered intervention/MTSS
2. Analysis and adjustments based on weekly district made formative assessments and quarterly district benchmark assessments.
3. Walkthroughs/observations during ELA instruction and planning to provide specific feedback.
4. Monthly ELA vertical articulation meetings to discuss student data and discuss areas of need.
5. Grade-level intervention time each day to focus on specific areas of need for students.

Person Responsible Jessica Vieira (vieiraje@collierschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: FSA data shows that 68% of current VME fifth grade students scored a level 4 or 5 in math. In ELA this cohort of students had 49% scoring a level 4 or 5. These students were not formally FSA tested last year and had a semester of nontraditional schooling. These factors could impact student achievement because traditional systems were not in place. The district assessments that were administered showed these students did not maintain their previous scores in math or ELA which identifies this group of students as an area of need.

Measureable Outcome: VME will increase the % of students scoring a level 4 or 5 in Math (55%) and ELA (47%) as compared to last years Quarterly Benchmark 2 by 16% in Math and 5% in ELA by Spring 2020.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kriste Eaton (eatonk@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Student data binders to track data
2. Spiral review
3. Common formative assessment
4. Frequent progress monitoring
5. Scheduling/departmentalizing
6. Consistent use if evidence-based strategies in lesson planning
7. Cambridge strategies used in lesson planning

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Tracking student data is critical to determine what the students need to continue to make gains and allow the students to take ownership over their own learning, especially higher achieving students. Having consistent Cambridge strategies that are evidence based are going to help move these students to higher achievement levels. Departmentalizing also allows the teacher to focus more on specific content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration/Academic Coach present during planning
2. Weekly review of lesson plans
3. Classroom observations will include “look fors” for evidence-based strategies
4. Use of progress monitoring data to make instructional adjustments
5. Student data binders for students to track pre/post assessment data and set goals
6. Lessons plans monitored for rigor appropriate for the standards and high-quality, standards-aligned student work

Person Responsible Jessica Vieira (vieiraje@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We will follow the District policy for attendance and discipline but continue to encourage good attendance and positive behavior by having engaging school-wide activities and lessons for our students. We will use our Leader in ME activities and structures to encourage positive behavior as well.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

VME is a school with strong support from stakeholders. Utilizing the Leader in ME framework VME makes strides every year to employ strategies to impact a positive school culture. Teachers and staff feel valued in the decisions that are made with staffing and school-wide decisions. Students are also an important part of the decision making at VME, we utilize surveys to determine the wants and needs of our student population. VME also has a strong relationship with FGCU. FGCU classes and interns are a part of our VME campus, they learn directly from VME teachers under the guidance of their FGCU supervisor. Our communication with parents and open door policy foster a sense of belonging for parents as well. Parent input is valued in school decision making. Surveys along with meetings with our PTO and SAC (School Advisory Council) allow us to disseminate information and get feedback from these stakeholders. Our PTO is highly involved and feels important in the decisions that are made for students

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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