Okeechobee County School District

Okeechobee Virtual Franchise

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Okeechobee Virtual Franchise

1000 NW 34TH ST, Okeechobee, FL 34972

www.okee.k12.fl.us

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	48%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	0%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	F	I

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Okeechobee 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 prepare all students to be college and career ready and function as productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Achieving Excellence: Putting Students First!

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Steiert, Lonnie	Principal

Duties

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

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

Friday 8/3/2018

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3	1	0	8

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	1	0	1	1	0	0	3

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3	1	0	8

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	1	0	1	1	0	0	3

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?

Graduation rate

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Graduation rate

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

Graduation rate

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

No students were identified through the Early Warning System.

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

Due to a small student population, it is not possible to make any specific conclusions about what particular steps led to the improvement.

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	0%	0%	60%	0%	0%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	0%	57%	0%	0%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	0%	52%	0%	0%	49%
Math Achievement	0%	0%	61%	0%	0%	56%
Math Learning Gains	0%	0%	58%	0%	0%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	0%	52%	0%	0%	48%
Science Achievement	0%	0%	57%	0%	0%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	0%	77%	0%	0%	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 (1)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (3)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (3)
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 (1)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (3)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (8)

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%	41%	-41%	52%	-52%
	2017	0%	37%	-37%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2018	0%	32%	-32%	51%	-51%
	2017	0%	36%	-36%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018					
	2017	0%	46%	-46%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2018	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
	2017	0%	40%	-40%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2018	0%	42%	-42%	53%	-53%
	2017	18%	34%	-16%	50%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
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%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
	2017	0%	44%	-44%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2018	0%	46%	-46%	54%	-54%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018					
	2017	0%	39%	-39%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	60%	-60%	65%	-65%
2017	0%	52%	-52%	63%	-63%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	50%	-50%	71%	-71%
2017	0%	52%	-52%	69%	-69%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	52%	-52%	68%	-68%
2017	0%	54%	-54%	67%	-67%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	54%	-54%	62%	-62%
2017	0%	46%	-46%	60%	-60%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	44%	-44%	56%	-56%
2017	0%	37%	-37%	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
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	Student Engagement and Graduation Rate: Graduation Advocates
Rationale	Graduation Advocates are a supplemental resource whose goal is to connect with, and secure help from key stakeholders who can assist students in successfully navigating the road to graduation. Using the high school models of graduation coach support, the Okeechobee Virtual Franchise will provide a similar support through a graduation advocate. As a result of programs graduation coaches developed, facilitated, and/or supported, students are afforded the extra guidance and supports needed to graduate with their cohort.
Intended Outcome	To increase the graduation rate of Okeechobee Virtual Franchise students in the 2018-19 school year.
Point Person	[no one identified]
Action Step	
Description	Identify and hire the best qualified individual to serve as the Graduation Advocate(s) for the program. Plan for best course of action in assessing student participation and grades for Graduation Advocate to monitor and assist students through their academic program in order to successfully complete high school and graduate.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Student assessment data will be monitored to assess the impact of services on student achievement and the percentage of students earning a high school diploma will be evaluated. All will be considered measures of effectiveness for the supports and services provided to Okeechobee Virtual Franchise students.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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.

This school is not a Title I school.

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.

If students have needs then referrals to counseling are made to the appropriate agencies.

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

This is a K-12 school. Students meet with the principal and discuss the courses for the next school year. Many students choose to return to the brick and mortar school.

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.

The resources for the program is the contract with NEFEC (North Eastern Florida Educational Consortium). The school is supported by the Digital classroom program for the loaning of computers, if necessary. The school is funded solely through FEEP dollars generated by the students taking the courses.

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

Students may enroll in Dual Enrollment classes or Advanced Placement classes if they meet the qualification requirements. Students may also elect to attend the brick and mortar school to complete career classes that lead to industry certifications.

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$10,000.00**