

Orange County Public Schools

# Ocvs Virtual Franchise



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>14</b>

## Ocvs Virtual Franchise

4000 SILVER STAR RD, Orlando, FL 32808

<https://ocvs.ocps.net/>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	24%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

### School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	A	A	A*

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.**

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community

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

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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

Name	Title
Gurley, Brandi	Principal
Lerman, Amy	Assistant Principal
Johnson, Amanda	School Counselor
Lohr, Renee	Other
Walker, Stephanie	School Counselor
Walsh, Anne	Instructional Coach
Marshall, Vanessa	Other
Phillips, Renee	Other
Sparks, Tonja	Dean

**Duties**

**Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.**

Principal/Assistant Principal will:

- \*Facilitate implementation of MTSS process
- \*Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development
- \*Analyze student data to determine achievements and opportunities for growth
- \*Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS process
- \*Conduct classroom walk-through observations to monitor the effectiveness of instruction

The Classroom Teacher will:

- \*Compile a data folder of progress monitoring notes (curriculum assessments, FLRKS, MAPS, ELA and Math FSA scores, work samples, and anecdotes) to be filed in each student's cumulative folder:
- \*Attend and participate in MTSS team meetings to collaborate on and monitor students who are struggling
- \*Design check points for student mastery of or progress towards grade level standards
- \*Implement interventions designed by the MTSS team for students in Tier 2 and 3
- \*Implement instructional interventions with fidelity

The Instructional Coach will:

- \*Attend MTSS Team meetings
- \* Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction
- \*Implement tier 2 and 3 interventions
- \*Keep progress monitoring notes and anecdotes of interventions implemented
- \*Collect school-wide data for the team to use in determining struggling learners
- \* Attend MTSS Team meetings for tier 2 and tier 3 students
- \*Assist with tier 2 and 3 interventions through collaboration, training, and/or direct student contact

Guidance Counselors/Dean:

- \*Provides expertise and support in identifying students and selecting appropriate interventions for behavior, including the creation of guidance groups, participating in MTSS meetings, and assisting in the creation MTSS behavior, action and support plans.
  - \*Assist MTSS team with interventions
  - \*Conduct social-developmental history interviews and share with the MTSS team
- Each school-based leadership team member will analyze the data and help create and implement necessary action plans for students to show learning gains. Information will

## Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	1	0	0	6

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected

Monday 7/30/2018

## Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	6	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

## Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	6	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

During the 17-18 school year, ELA Lowest 25 percent was the lowest performing category scoring at 50 percent on target. ELA Lowest 25 percent data for the last four years is listed below:

14-15: NA

15-16: 83%

16-17: 62%  
17-18: 50%

Over the last several years, the ELA Lowest 25 percent has declined ranging from 83 percent to 50 percent.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

We have seen the greatest decline, 13 points, in ELA Lowest 25 percent during the 17-18 school year.

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

In most categories, OCVS has scored above the state average. During the 17-18 school year, OCVS scored 52 percent on Math Learning Gains while the state average was 58 percent which totaled a gap of 6 points.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

The component which showed the most improvement during the 17-18 school year was Math Achievement.

Orange County Virtual School (OCVS) improved 19 points in this category. Math data for the last four years is listed below:

14-15: 58%  
15-16: 65%  
16-17: 58%  
17-18: 77%

Scores remained stable ranging from 58 percent to 77 percent from 2014-2017. During the 2017-2018, scores drastically increased to 77 percent on target.

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.**

Math has been one of our focuses over the last year. Teachers spent time collaborating in Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings to discuss the four essential PLC questions including:

1. What do we expect our students to learn?
2. How will we know they are learning?
3. How will we respond when they don't learn?
4. How will we respond if they already know it?

This collaboration helped teachers focus on instruction and student needs. They were able to determine the appropriate response when students were not learning and also what support to put in place to help them to be successful.

MTSS meetings also took place to ensure students had the appropriate interventions in place. In addition, IReady was also used with students in Kindergarten through 8th grade as a tiered intervention. Students who met their required minutes each week made drastic improvement on their state assessments.

Teachers also worked hard to provide additional support for students who had challenges with the curriculum. Face to Face lessons, tutoring sessions, and live lessons were all used to ensure students were grasping critical content.

### 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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	83%	60%	60%	93%	68%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	57%	57%	71%	61%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	54%	52%	83%	54%	49%
Math Achievement	76%	60%	61%	65%	62%	56%
Math Learning Gains	55%	60%	58%	68%	59%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	55%	52%	62%	47%	48%
Science Achievement	75%	56%	57%	74%	58%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	74%	77%	94%	82%	72%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (6)	0 (5)	1 (1)	0 (1)	3 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (15)

### 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	2018	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%
	2017	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
	2017	0%	57%	-57%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018					
	2017	0%	51%	-51%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2018	0%	48%	-48%	52%	-52%
	2017	0%	52%	-52%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2018	86%	48%	38%	51%	35%



ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2017	77%	52%	25%	52%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		86%				
08	2018	88%	55%	33%	58%	30%
	2017	80%	52%	28%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
09	2018	73%	50%	23%	53%	20%
	2017	77%	49%	28%	52%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
10	2018	58%	49%	9%	53%	5%
	2017	31%	47%	-16%	50%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		27%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
	2017	0%	63%	-63%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
	2017	0%	64%	-64%	64%	-64%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018					
	2017	0%	56%	-56%	57%	-57%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2018	0%	35%	-35%	52%	-52%
	2017	0%	43%	-43%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2018	0%	51%	-51%	54%	-54%
	2017	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018	0%	32%	-32%	45%	-45%
	2017	0%	30%	-30%	46%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	0%	53%	-53%	55%	-55%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	0%	49%	-49%	50%	-50%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	72%	62%	10%	65%	7%
2017	88%	60%	28%	63%	25%
Compare		-16%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	92%	66%	26%	71%	21%
2017	94%	67%	27%	69%	25%
Compare		-2%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	75%	65%	10%	68%	7%
2017	80%	64%	16%	67%	13%
Compare		-5%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	75%	61%	14%	62%	13%
2017	63%	53%	10%	60%	3%
Compare		12%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	65%	-65%	56%	-56%
2017	68%	43%	25%	53%	15%
Compare		-68%			

## Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
BLK	67	50									
HSP	100	75		91	73					94	40
WHT	75	46		65	45			73		100	33
FRL	75	42		84	50					93	43
2017 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
BLK	65	50		47	38						
HSP	78	75		72	38					91	40
WHT	88	59		67	38		87	91		94	40
FRL	70	50		50	50		50			91	50

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

**Areas of Focus:**

Activity #1	
<b>Title</b>	By June 2019, Orange County Virtual School will increase the percentage of students in the Lowest 25 percentile achieving learning gains on the FSA ELA assessment.
<b>Rationale</b>	In order to see an increase in academic achievement of the Lowest 25th percentile of students, Orange County Virtual School will focus on ELA instructional strategies. The collaborative structure provided within PLC meetings and professional development will assist with building instructional capacity and improving student learning.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	ELA learning gains for the Lowest 25th percentile will increase from 50% to 60%.
<b>Point Person</b>	Brandi Gurley (brandi.gurley@ocps.net)
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	Teachers will attend school wide, statewide, and district PLC meetings specific to the implementation of standards-based instruction and supplemental curriculum that support these standards.
	Professional development will be presented on supplemental resources and monitoring procedures to ensure expectations are being met with fidelity. Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will utilize I-Ready with fidelity and will be presented additional lessons to target deficit areas.
	Kindergarten through 8th grade students will be administered the i-Ready diagnostic assessment three times per year to determine whether intervention strategies are decreasing gaps in learning.
	We will continue to focus on our Culturally Responsive school plan to build upon instruction and to provide differentiation and equitable access to education for students from all cultures.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Brandi Gurley (brandi.gurley@ocps.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
<b>Description</b>	The leadership team will conduct observations and provide teachers with actionable feedback on standards based instruction. In addition, student data will be monitored to determine if strategies being implemented are effective. During monthly data meetings, formative and summative student data will be discussed to determine whether or not students need additional support. Leadership team members will meet weekly to discuss findings and trends that they have observed within their classroom walkthroughs and PLC meetings.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Amy Lerman (amy.lerman@ocps.net)

Activity #2	
<b>Title</b>	By June 2019, Orange County Virtual School will increase the percentage of students achieving learning gains on the FSA Math assessment.
<b>Rationale</b>	In order to see an increase in math learning gains, Orange County Virtual School will focus on math instructional strategies. The collaborative structure provided within PLC meetings and professional development will assist with building instructional capacity and improving student learning.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	Learning gains in math will increase by 10% overall and in the lowest 25 percentile.
<b>Point Person</b>	Brandi Gurley (brandi.gurley@ocps.net)
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	Teachers will attend school wide, statewide, and district PLC meetings specific to the implementation of standards-based instruction and supplemental curriculum that support these standards.
	Professional development will be presented on supplemental resources and monitoring procedures to ensure expectations are being met with fidelity. Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will utilize I-Ready math with fidelity and will be presented additional lessons to target deficit areas.
	Kindergarten through 8th grade students will be administered the i-Ready math diagnostic assessment three times per year to determine whether intervention strategies are decreasing gaps in learning.
	We will continue to focus on our Culturally Responsive school plan to build upon instruction to provide differentiation and equitable access to education for students from all cultures.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	[no one identified]
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
<b>Description</b>	The leadership team will conduct observations and provide teachers with actionable feedback on standards based instruction. In addition, student data will be monitored to determine if strategies being implemented are effective. During monthly data meetings, formative and summative student data will be discussed to determine whether or not students need additional support. Leadership team members will meet weekly to discuss findings and trends that they have observed within their classroom walkthroughs and PLC meetings.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Brandi Gurley (brandi.gurley@ocps.net)

### Activity #3

<b>Title</b>	By June 2019, Orange County Virtual School will increase the completion rate of courses (as compared to data from SY 2017-2018) by utilizing monitoring strategies. (Division Priority: Narrowing Achievement Gaps/Supportive Environment)
<b>Rationale</b>	In order to see an increase in completion rates, teachers will focus on monitoring student pacing, participate in professional development and side by side coaching. In addition, they will continue to focus on communication, engagement strategies, and building relationships with their students.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	Student completion rates will increase overall by 2%. In addition, teachers will build a stronger understanding of how important communication, engagement strategies, and building relationships are with their students. As of June 26, 2018, completions totaled 26,086.
<b>Point Person</b>	Amy Lerman (amy.lerman@ocps.net)

### Action Step

<b>Description</b>	Teachers will be provided ongoing professional development regarding monitoring tools available within our virtual management system, VSA. They will be provided in-house professional development regarding monitoring strategies that are working within Orange County Virtual School classrooms. By building capacity about monitoring within the instructional staff, students will continuously maintain pace to complete coursework on or before their scheduled completion date.  A professional development calendar will be created that will provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate and learn best practices for monitoring virtual education students and aid them in completing courses successfully on or before their scheduled completion date.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Amy Lerman (amy.lerman@ocps.net)

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

<b>Description</b>	Student pace will be monitored in the virtual management system, VSA, and discussed in data meetings and Professional Learning Community Meetings.  The Leadership Team will compare the 2018-2019 completions quarterly to the 2018-2019 completions to determine if improvements are being made.  Orange County Virtual School Blended Specialists will continue to monitor classroom completion during their monthly classroom walkthroughs. They will report out to administration during their weekly Leadership Team Meeting. If support is needed, a plan will be put in place to assist struggling teachers.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Brandi Gurley (brandi.gurley@ocps.net)

## Part V: Budget

<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
---------------	---------------