Hernando Eschool Virtual Franchise

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hernando Eschool Virtual Franchise

1070 VARSITY DR, Brooksville, FL 34601

[no web address on file]

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)
High School 6-12	No	0%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18
Grade	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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 expand access to education, meeting the needs of our learners and investing in the leaders of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hernando eSchool's instructional program offers a variety of assignment and assessment techniques that address various learning styles. Online learning enables students to assume responsibility for their own learning.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Coniglio, Elizabeth	Administrative Support
Wiseman, Zana	Principal
Gregory, Kara	Teacher, K-12

Duties

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

Beth is our Assessment Coordinator, she compiles test data for us to review. She gives input on deficits and how we can close the gaps with instruction.
Zana Brooks is the Principal and pulls attendance reports, completion rates and registration information to make decisions about PD that may be needed for student engagement.
Kara Gregory is the liaison between the teachers and the SAC committee.

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	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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected

Tuesday 9/4/2018

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	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	

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?

Biology we had 2 students test and they both scored a level 2. No, we cannot determine if it is a trend with only 2 years of data.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Geometry EOC had the greatest decline. We went from a 100% pass rate to a 33% pass rate.

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

Bioligy had the biggest gap with 21 points below the state mean.

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

Algebra one showed the most improvement, we went from a 50% pass rate to a 100% pass rate.

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

We implemented a face to face tutoring session for our struggling students and increased our online tutoring support.

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	86%	48%	56%	0%	44%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	48%	53%	0%	37%	46%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	39%	44%	0%	26%	38%
Math Achievement	72%	47%	51%	0%	45%	43%
Math Learning Gains	56%	43%	48%	0%	40%	39%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	40%	45%	0%	33%	38%
Science Achievement	0%	58%	67%	0%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	68%	71%	0%	71%	69%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (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 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (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 (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
06	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
	2017	0%	52%	-52%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	0%	51%	-51%	51%	-51%
	2017	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018	0%	54%	-54%	58%	-58%
	2017	0%	49%	-49%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2018	0%	50%	-50%	53%	-53%
	2017	0%	46%	-46%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2018	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
	2017	0%	42%	-42%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
	2017	0%	53%	-53%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	0%	63%	-63%	54%	-54%
	2017	0%	61%	-61%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018	0%	53%	-53%	45%	-45%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2018	0%	56%	-56%	50%	-50%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	0%	58%	-58%	65%	-65%
2017	0%	67%	-67%	63%	-63%
Compare	0%				

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	0%	74%	-74%	71%	-71%
2017	0%	76%	-76%	69%	-69%
Compare	0%				

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	0%	68%	-68%	68%	-68%
2017	0%	69%	-69%	67%	-67%
Compare	0%				

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
2017	0%	59%	-59%	60%	-60%
Compare	0%				

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	0%	45%	-45%	56%	-56%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2017	0%	50%	-50%	53%	-53%
Compare		0%			

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
WHT	88	56		64	50					100	36
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

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

Title	Completion Rate
Rationale	If students complete, we get funding.
Intended Outcome	Increase completion rate by 2%.
Point Person	Zana Wiseman (wiseman_z@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description	The SBLT team will look at teacher data and determine if PD is needed for teachers to complete students. The PD team will then create those opportunities for teachers, teacher will have access through Canvas.
Person Responsible	Zana Wiseman (wiseman_z@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	I will pull progress reports each month on all teachers to see which students are lagging in progress. I will send individual data to teachers with student names and possible action steps to re-engage the students. These include but are not limited to: calls, emails and text to student and parent with sample language. I will also complete lab visits if necessary.
Person Responsible	Zana Wiseman (wiseman_z@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	Maintain Attendance Rate
Rationale	If students complete work each week they will finish the course for funding.
Intended Outcome	Maintain a 92% attendance rate this year.
Point Person	Zana Wiseman (wiseman_z@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	SBLT will look at walkthrough data and identify areas of PD. The PD team will then create those opportunities for teachers, teacher will have access through Canvas.
Person Responsible	Zana Wiseman (wiseman_z@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	I will pull progress reports each month on all teachers to see which students are lagging in progress. I will send individual data to teachers with student names and possible action steps to re-engage the students. These include but are not limited to: calls, emails and text to student and parent with sample language. I will also complete lab visits if necessary.
Person Responsible	Zana Wiseman (wiseman_z@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$0.00**