

School District of Osceola County, FL

# Florida Cyber Charter Academy At Osceola



## 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>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

## Florida Cyber Charter Academy At Osceola

9143 PHILLIPS HWY SUITE 590, Jacksonville, FL 32256

<https://flcca.k12.com/>

### 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	68%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	51%

### School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2013-14
Grade	D	C	I	F

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola 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.

Florida Cyber Charter Academy (FLCCA) is a high quality, virtual public charter school dedicated to providing an innovative educational environment in which all students have the opportunity to succeed. We value rigorous and real-world instruction as we ask one question of ourselves daily: Are our students learning? Our mission is to help students reach their full-potential by utilizing a highly effective curriculum and implementing classes that are student-centered, data-driven and engaging for all learners. FLCCA strives to celebrate diversity and build community while using cutting-edge technology to break down barriers and create productive citizens who are successful in their future endeavors. We are able to accomplish this through our community of students, families, teachers, administration and a governing board who are invested in pursuing academic excellence for all.

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

It is the vision of Florida Cyber Charter Academies to provide a high-quality, online public charter school that will build a community of students, families, educators and a governing board dedicated to providing a high-quality learning environment which will be accountable for developing each student's full potential

by utilizing research-based technology applications, meaningful teacher/student/parent involvement, and engaging, individualized learning. We will equip every student with the academic and nonacademic foundations needed for any post-secondary opportunity they wish to pursue.

We believe...

- in individualized learning through mass customization instead of mass production of education.
- in decades of scientific research regarding how brains really work and how learning happens.
- the Big Ideas + Consecutive Down Payments + Practice = Mastery.
- that mastery of concepts and skills should be for all kinds of children- not just the "best and brightest."
- in giving parents meaningful ways to be involved in their children's education if they choose.
- in being directly accountable and responsive to all of our stakeholders.
- in outstanding teacher encouragement.
- in rich, engaging content that gets kids into learning so learning gets into them.
- in using 21st- century tools to prepare 21st-century students.
- in books and digital media—because a mix of teaching tools maximizes learning.
- that children should be introduced to humankind's legacies which create our common culture as humans.
- that raw, unyielding passion is our most important quality.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title
Anthony, Sandra	Principal
White, Bridget	Other
Sheffield, Samantha	Assistant Principal
Young, Crystal	Other

## Duties

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

Dr. Sandra Anthony, Head of School/Principal, supports leadership development, board relations, school and district wide operations, systems management, budget management, oversight of all academic programs and managing relationships with K12 inc. Bridget White, Assessment and Accountability Administrator, directs all assessment for the school, including internal and state mandated test, and manages district relationships to ensure accountability measures are in place and enforced. Ms Traci Hill, Compliance and Operations Manager, along with her team manage the onboarding of new students and supports the parent and student engagement programs to enable online learning success. Elementary Academic Administrator, Samantha Sheffield conducts staff observations and evaluations of teachers, assisting in implementing and monitoring student engagement practices, participating in regular academic and school leadership team meetings, ensuring that the school is meeting the needs of students and implementing the school's academic plan. Ms Stacey Atiyah and Ms Leeanna Young support students with special needs including special education, 504 and ELL.

These core members serve along with a team of school leaders to support the instructional program, collaborate and communicate on initiatives and programs as well as sharing in the decisions that drive student achievement.

## 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	16	11	9	9	19	7	25	68	22	40	42	38	12	318
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	6	7	2	12	11	22	17	18	18	29	23	1	173
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	24	37	25	61	45	52	60	29	0	0	333

**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	4	0	2	8	10	10	2	10	18	16	16	10	0	106

**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	0	1	6	6	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	34
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	1	10

**Date this data was collected**

Tuesday 7/17/2018

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	

**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	2	1	2	1	2	2	3	1	2	6	1	2	25
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	2	0	0	4	1	6	0	0	4	5	1	23
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	7	7	2	3	2	4	2	0	0	34

**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	3	0	0	1	1	0	5

**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?**

The three math components were the bottom three performance areas. The lowest was Math Lowest 25th percentile; however, all were below 30%. The low math achievement component performance is a

trend, when comparing 2018 to 2017. When looking at subgroup data for these three components, Math Achievement was the lowest component for all subgroups. Math Achievement for Free & Reduced Lunch, Multiracial, Hispanic and Black were all under 25%. Students with Disabilities was 3% in Math Achievement.

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

The greatest overall declines happened in ELA Learning Gains with a decline of 17% and Math Learning Gains with a decline of 15%. The greatest declines in grade level data were both in 6th grade Math with 28% and 6th grade ELA with 27% declines.

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

Math achievement had the biggest gap when compared to the state average. Specifically in Grades 3-5 and Algebra EOC with differences between 35-40%.

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

The most improved component was Science Achievement. The Biology EOC scores increased 54%, when comparing 2018 to 2017.

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

Science teachers used close reading strategies in their classroom to make the science content be more accessible for all students regardless of performance levels.

**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	39%	58%	60%	0%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	58%	57%	0%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	52%	52%	0%	46%	49%
Math Achievement	27%	52%	61%	0%	49%	56%
Math Learning Gains	29%	54%	58%	0%	48%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	24%	50%	52%	0%	43%	48%
Science Achievement	41%	54%	57%	0%	49%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	43%	71%	77%	0%	74%	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	16 (0)	11 (0)	9 (0)	9 (0)	19 (0)	7 (0)	25 (0)	68 (0)	22 (0)	40 (0)	42 (0)	38 (0)	12 (0)	318 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	7 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)	2 (0)	12 (0)	11 (0)	22 (0)	17 (0)	18 (0)	18 (0)	29 (0)	23 (0)	1 (0)	173 (0)

### 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	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	24 (0)	37 (0)	25 (0)	61 (0)	45 (0)	52 (0)	60 (0)	29 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	333 (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	2018	41%	51%	-10%	57%	-16%
	2017	43%	53%	-10%	58%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	38%	48%	-10%	56%	-18%
	2017	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		38%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2018	41%	50%	-9%	55%	-14%
	2017	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		41%				
Cohort Comparison		41%				
06	2018	33%	46%	-13%	52%	-19%
	2017	60%	47%	13%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-27%				
Cohort Comparison		33%				
07	2018	37%	46%	-9%	51%	-14%
	2017	47%	49%	-2%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
08	2018	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
	2017	64%	48%	16%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
09	2018	38%	47%	-9%	53%	-15%
	2017	0%	48%	-48%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		38%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
10	2018	48%	49%	-1%	53%	-5%
	2017	0%	47%	-47%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		48%				
Cohort Comparison		48%				



MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	22%	51%	-29%	62%	-40%
	2017	29%	56%	-27%	62%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	22%	53%	-31%	62%	-40%
	2017	20%	55%	-35%	64%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2018	26%	52%	-26%	61%	-35%
	2017	0%	49%	-49%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
06	2018	22%	43%	-21%	52%	-30%
	2017	50%	41%	9%	51%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-28%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
07	2018	35%	29%	6%	54%	-19%
	2017	44%	28%	16%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
08	2018	29%	43%	-14%	45%	-16%
	2017	0%	47%	-47%	46%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		29%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	33%	49%	-16%	55%	-22%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	30%	42%	-12%	50%	-20%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		30%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	54%	68%	-14%	65%	-11%
2017	0%	69%	-69%	63%	-63%
Compare		54%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	40%	70%	-30%	71%	-31%
2017	42%	74%	-32%	69%	-27%
Compare		-2%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	52%	61%	-9%	68%	-16%
2017	0%	63%	-63%	67%	-67%
Compare		52%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	28%	52%	-24%	62%	-34%
2017	33%	46%	-13%	60%	-27%
Compare		-5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	30%	39%	-9%	56%	-26%
2017	0%	43%	-43%	53%	-53%
Compare		30%			

### Subgroup Data

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	16	35	31	3	17		20	10			
ASN	85			77							
BLK	31	44	55	17	20	21	36	23			
HSP	33	41	48	22	27	38	25	48			
MUL	50	44		21	22						
WHT	42	40	30	30	32	20	52	46	16		
FRL	48	40	33	25	30	33	34	30	18		
<b>2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
SWD	30										
HSP	48	50		17	57						
WHT	52	59		33	31		30	64			
FRL	44	55		12	33						

### **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>	Strengthen collaborative processes to ensure that the learning needs of all students are met.
<b>Rationale</b>	Research states, if teachers participate in authentic collaborative teams, that result in targeted instructional grouping with engaging lessons and are monitoring student progress to inform instruction, then student achievement will increase.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	<p>ELA proficiency and gains will increase by 10% in all sub groups.</p> <p>Math proficiency will increase by 8% and gains will increase by 10% in all sub groups.</p> <p>ELA and Math lowest 25% gains will increase by 6%.</p> <p>Science proficiency will increase by 9% in all sub groups.</p> <p>Social Studies proficiency will increase by 7% in all sub groups.</p>
<b>Point Person</b>	Sandra Anthony (santhony@k12.com)
Action Step	
	<p>Achievement PLC teams will meet bi-weekly to analyze student-level concept mastery in order to reflect and revise course progression, instructional grouping and instructional strategies.</p> <p>Classroom formative assessments will be used to gauge and monitor student mastery. Teachers will prepare formative assessment data based on identified standards prior to achievement PLC team meetings.</p> <p>District formative assessment will be given every nine weeks in all accountability areas.</p> <p>Instructional Leaders will meet bi-weekly individually with teachers to review outcomes of classroom formative assessments, strategies of targeted instruction and walkthroughs outcomes to measure effective implementation of action plan.</p>
<b>Description</b>	<p>Instructional Coaches will meet bi-weekly individually with Math and ELA teachers to provide specific instructional strategies in effective online instruction, including but not limited to engaging students, the use of effective questioning and ensuring rigor and relevance during academic learning time.</p> <p>Professional Development will be conducted consistently throughout the year to build shared practices and improve individual instructional practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School Leadership Team data drive instruction training Sept. 13 and ongoing weekly through Dec.</li> <li>- School Leadership Team walkthrough and instructional practices feedback training Sept. 6</li> <li>- Targeted Instructional Practices Training Sept. 21</li> <li>- Targeted Instructional Practices collaborative implementation groups meet monthly beginning August 27.</li> </ul>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Sandra Anthony (santhony@k12.com)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
<b>Description</b>	<p>Administration will monitor achievement PLC teams to ensure action plans are developed and implemented.</p> <p>Instructional Coaching rubrics will be used to measure effective use of Targeted</p>

Instructional Practices.

Instructional Leaders will track walkthrough feedback and monitor formative assessment results.

Readiness assessment results will be reviewed for student gains by school leadership team.

**Person Responsible** Sandra Anthony (santhony@k12.com)

Activity #2	
<b>Title</b>	Ensure high levels of learning for all student in literacy.
<b>Rationale</b>	Research states, if highly-skilled teachers implement a balanced literacy curriculum coupled with targeted instructional grouping, engaging lessons based on rigorous and effective research-based instructional practices, use a strategic unified assessment system, and teachers effectively monitor and analyze student progress to inform instruction, then on-grade level literacy will increase for all students (including: race/ethnicity, gender, English Language Learner, students from disadvantaged backgrounds, students with disabilities, and gifted students).
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	<p>ELA proficiency and gains will increase by 10% in all sub groups on the FSA ELA/Reading (3rd-10th), and i-Ready Diagnostic assessment (K-2nd).</p> <p>ELA lowest 25% gains will increase by 6% on the FSA ELA/Reading (3rd-10th), and i-Ready Diagnostic assessment (K-2nd). .</p>
<b>Point Person</b>	Sandra Anthony (santhony@k12.com)
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	<p>Teachers will utilize high quality targeted instructional materials for Tier 1 instruction in order to increase student exposure to rigorous and relevant learning targets and tasks. Instruction will include research-based technology use for enrichment/intervention groups to ensure continued learning gains and close achievement gaps. Students will be exposed to varied and high-quality questions, providing a balanced mix of question types, including knowledge and comprehension; application and analysis; and creation and evaluation.</p> <p>Teachers will participate in biweekly PLC meetings to share best practices, plan activities with the high-quality instructional materials to ensure that every student is provided a differentiated plan for learning that will maximize their potential for proficiency.</p> <p>Instructional leaders will meet bi-weekly individually with teachers to analyze data, facilitate professional learning sessions, and conduct collaborative conversations to build knowledge and support teachers.</p> <p>ELA Teachers will meet individually on a bi-weekly basis with Instructional Coaches to provide specific instructional strategies in effective online instruction. Data will be progress monitored to guide teachers to make appropriate instructional decisions, and set appropriate rigorous learning targets for students.</p>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Sandra Anthony (santhony@k12.com)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
<b>Description</b>	<p>Monitoring of weekly teacher lesson plan alignment to Florida State Standards and high-quality instructional practices.</p> <p>Observation cycles and classroom walkthroughs will serve as a supportive approach to monitoring the implementation of high-quality instruction with fidelity.</p> <p>Instructional Coaching rubrics will be used to measure effective use of Targeted Instructional Practices.</p>

The leadership team will meet weekly to analyze data, provide effective quality feedback on all data reports, to identify targeted or comprehensive support needs for teachers' instructional practices.

Readiness assessment results will be reviewed for student gains by school leadership team.

**Person Responsible** Sandra Anthony (santhony@k12.com)

Activity #3	
<b>Title</b>	Ensure high levels of mathematics achievement for all students.
<b>Rationale</b>	Research states, if educators encourage students to approach mathematics with a growth mindset with emphasis of shifting from closed-answer questioning to discovery-based learning exploration specifically of careful error analysis of students' errors and the use of concrete manipulatives, will lead to student self-efficacy and potentially raise student achievement.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	Math proficiency will increase by 8% and gains will increase by 10% in all sub groups on the FSA Mathematics (3rd-10th) and i-Ready Diagnostic (K-2nd).  Math lowest 25% gains will increase by 6% on the FSA Mathematics (3rd-10th) and i-Ready Diagnostic (K-2nd)
<b>Point Person</b>	Sandra Anthony (santhony@k12.com)
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	Teachers will utilize targeted instructional practices in order to increase student exposure to rigorous and relevant learning goals and tasks. Students will be exposed to math application of skills and targets that encourages students to think, reason, and make sense of the intended learning target through varied complexity questioning.
	Classroom formative assessments will be used to gauge and monitor student mastery on a weekly basis.
	District interim assessment will be given every nine weeks in all accountability areas. Students will complete growth monitoring checks on a monthly basis to progress monitor students' on-grade level mathematics competency prior to statewide assessment administration.
	Teachers will use the assessment results to create targeted instructional groups based on specific performance gaps and needs of the students directly aligned to grade level standards.
	Instructional Leaders will meet bi-weekly individually with teachers to review outcomes of classroom data to guide teachers to make appropriate instructional decisions, implement strategies of targeted instruction and set appropriate rigorous standards aligned to grade level standards.
	Instructional Coaches will meet bi-weekly individually with math teachers to provide specific instructional strategies in effective online instruction.
	Professional Development will be conducted consistently throughout the year to build shared practices and improve individual instructional practices: - School Leadership Team data drive instruction training Sept. 13 and ongoing weekly through Dec. - School Leadership Team walkthrough and instructional practices feedback training Sept. 6 - Targeted Instructional Practices Training Sept. 21 - Targeted Instructional Practices collaborative implementation groups meet monthly beginning August 27.



**Person Responsible** Sandra Anthony (santhony@k12.com)

#### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Instructional Coaching rubrics will be used to measure effective use of Targeted Instructional Practices.

**Description** Instructional Leaders will track outcomes through walkthrough feedback and monitor formative assessment results to measure effective implementation of action plan.

Readiness assessment results will be reviewed for student gains by school leadership team.

**Person Responsible** Sandra Anthony (santhony@k12.com)

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

### **Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

Florida Cyber Charter Academy at Osceola strives daily to build positive relationships with families in an effort to increase parent involvement in order to meet the school's vision and mission for each student. FLCCA provides an extensive support system to both parents and students. Parents serve a critical role in the education process and are partners to teachers in promoting accountability for their students and the entire FLCCA community. Parents are encouraged to attend school outings, field trips, and other outside learning opportunities with their child.

Parents conference with teachers on a regular basis via zoom, phone, email, and synchronous sessions using BlackBoard Collaborate, as well as in-person meetings to discuss their child's progress.

Teachers initiate regular conferences and conversations with parents about their child's progress.

Parents are encouraged to contact teachers, specialists, administrators, and other FLCCA parents to solve problems, give feedback, or pass on ideas and insights to the school community. FLCCA will survey parents online annually to determine their satisfaction with their overall experience. Elements of the survey will include the curriculum, instruction, Online School, administration, support, quality of materials, student progress, student attitude towards learning, communication, and interaction with other FLCCA students and parents.

In addition to face-to-face interaction, FLCCA @ Osceola promotes social media connections via Facebook for connections between and among students, parents and teachers. Parents benefit from exchanging ideas and information with others using the K12 program and gain a sense of connectedness within the boundaries of a contained but global community.

### **PFEP Link**

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

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

To meet the social-emotional needs of all of our students, our Family-Academic Support Team (FAST) will offer guidance and support for all students based on teacher referrals. These teams will respond to the individual needs of students and provide counseling, mentoring and resilience resources to ensure that all barriers are removed from students ability to learn and fully participate in all school programs. The Child Study team includes the guidance counselor, teacher, family resource coordinator, FAST team member, ESE teacher and special programs coordinator (if applicable).

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

Learning Coaches, FAST members, counselors, and teachers employ strategies that support the transition from one grade level to the next. One way this is accomplished is through the use of readiness checklists. Readiness documents are informed of ways of working to ensure that both teachers and parents are equipped with the necessary tools to support students' success across grade levels. A part of a family's introduction to our school, we invite parents and teachers to an orientation sessions where they learn the school's policies, culture, scheduling/routines, and familiarize themselves with FLCCA's learning platform.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

FLCCA at Osceola's leadership team members work collaboratively to focus on systemic data-driven decision making and ensure MTSS infrastructures are coordinated throughout the school. The leadership team, as well as instructional staff, review data weekly to problem-solve at the school site level. Leadership team members and instructional staff examine the effectiveness of the MTSS infrastructure and share relevant grade band data to determine allocation of resources for the highest impact. Data is also utilized to identify areas for professional development, explicitly designed to further strengthen core instruction.

During grade band meetings, assistant principals present student level data collected from a wide variety of sources (weekly teacher-created direct instruction assessments, interim assessments, i-Ready data, course pass rates, attendance data, etc.). The team reviews all assessment data, addresses the effectiveness of core instruction, plans for and responds to student learning, and problem-solves to develop plans for students in need of Tier II and Tier III support/intervention.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

FLCCA offers core and elective courses in a variety of areas such as foreign languages, journalism, art history and digital art imaging. Courses that are geared towards helping students achieve their college and career goals through career research and decision-making. World Language and Honors courses are offered at upper grade levels and are beneficial to college-bound students. Additionally, clubs hosted by teachers for student interests such as robotics, coding, technology, and engineering are available. Students can sign up for clubs in their area of interest by visiting <http://www.k12.com/k12-student-clubs.html>

## Part V: Budget

Osceola - 0153 - Florida Cyber Charter Academy At Osceola - 2018-19 SIP  
Florida Cyber Charter Academy At Osceola

Total:	\$473,244.00
--------	--------------