Putnam Virtual Franchise

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Putnam Virtual Franchise

200 REID ST, Palatka, FL 32177

[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)
Combination School KG-12	No	64%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	13%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	F	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/6/2018.

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.

Our mission is to ensure all students are provided with an academically rich and rigorous education through outline learning opportunities that meet the needs of today's diverse learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Putnam Virtual School is to be leaders in innovative teaching through online and blended learning programs that use best practices that promote academic excellence and lifelong learning in a student centered environment.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Hough, Renee	Administrative Support
Burney, Amanda	School Counselor
Owens, Stacy	Registrar

Duties

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

The school based leadership team consists of the Administrator, Guidance Counselor, and Registrar. The Administrator is responsible for monitoring and overseeing the program. The counselor monitors student progress and notifies the student and parent of progress, evaluates course requirements and educational path, and conducts student/parent conferences. The registrar enrolls students in the school data base.

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

Monday 8/27/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students exhibiting two or more indicators		

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?

The lowest data component was Math learning gains. This component was also the lowest in the 2016-17 school year.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the 2016-17 school year was ELA achievement. ELA achievement dropped from 64% to 29%.

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

Math learning gains had the largest gap compared tot he state.

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

All data components showed a decline from the 2016-17 school year to the 2017-18 school year.

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

All data components showed a decline from the 2016-17 school year to the 2017-18 school year.

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	29%	57%	60%	0%	47%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	53%	57%	0%	45%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	62%	52%	0%	42%	49%
Math Achievement	23%	51%	61%	0%	38%	56%
Math Learning Gains	10%	33%	58%	0%	36%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	64%	52%	0%	33%	48%
Science Achievement	0%	93%	57%	0%	50%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	92%	77%	0%	61%	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 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (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)
Course failure in ELA or Math	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)

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 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	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
03	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2018	0%	42%	-42%	52%	-52%
	2017	0%	36%	-36%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2018	0%	38%	-38%	51%	-51%
	2017	0%	34%	-34%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018	0%	47%	-47%	58%	-58%
	2017	0%	35%	-35%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2018	0%	38%	-38%	53%	-53%
	2017	0%	33%	-33%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2018	0%	38%	-38%	53%	-53%
	2017	0%	38%	-38%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2018	0%	47%	-47%	52%	-52%
	2017	0%	38%	-38%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2018	0%	25%	-25%	54%	-54%
	2017	0%	27%	-27%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018	0%	16%	-16%	45%	-45%
	2017	0%	19%	-19%	46%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	0%	20%	-20%	50%	-50%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	0%	58%	-58%	65%	-65%
2017	0%	58%	-58%	63%	-63%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2018	0%	60%	-60%	71%	-71%
2017	0%	61%	-61%	69%	-69%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	53%	-53%	68%	-68%
2017	0%	55%	-55%	67%	-67%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	43%	-43%	62%	-62%
2017	0%	49%	-49%	60%	-60%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
2017	0%	38%	-38%	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	36	50									
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
WHT	70			42							

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	Monitoring Student Progress
Rationale	The 2018 school grade consisted of four components including achievement in ELA and Math and learning gains in ELA and Math. Achievement in ELA (64% to 29%), achievement in Math (36% to 23%). Learning Gains in ELA (70% to 42%) and learning gains in Math (27% to 10%).
Intended Outcome	If school leadership monitors student progress, then students will improve their completion rates, leading to increased student achievement for all students.
Point Person	Renee Hough (rhough@my.putnamschools.org)
Action Step	
Description	1) Students scoring level 1 and 2 will be placed in an intensive reading class in addition to grade level courses. 2) Students scoring level 1 and 2 will be placed in an intensive math class in addition to grade level courses. 3) Students will receive email feedback each week from the guidance counselor regarding course progress.
Person Responsible	Amanda Burney (a2burney@my.putnamschools.org)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	1) School leaders will review feedback of student progress.
Person Responsible	Renee Hough (rhough@my.putnamschools.org)