

Duval County Public Schools

Florida Cyber Charter Academy



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Florida Cyber Charter Academy

9143 PHILLIPS HWY STE. 590, Jacksonville, FL 32256

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

Demographics

Principal: Rita Whitten

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	64%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: I (%) 2016-17: D (35%) 2015-16: I (%) 2014-15: I (%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

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, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Florida Cyber Charter Academy

9143 PHILLIPS HWY STE. 590, Jacksonville, FL 32256

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-12</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>60%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>43%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	D	I	D	I

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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 @Duval (FLCCA @Duval) is a high quality, virtual public charter school dedicated to providing an innovative educational environment in which all students have the opportunity to succeed. 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 @Duval strives to celebrate diversity and build community while using innovative 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.

At FLCCA@ Duval, we believe in providing a supportive and motivating school environment where all students feel success today so they are prepared for tomorrow.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Anthony, Sandra	Principal	<p>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. More specifically, Dr. Anthony works with the Northeast Board of Directors acting as chief administrator the school; manages regulatory complexities and political sensitivities; implements the school's mission, vision, and strategic planning initiatives driven by K12 and the Board of Directors;</p> <p>develops plans and policies for the educational program; ensures policies and programs are carried out appropriately by all students, parents, and staff; communicates school budget decisions to K12 and the Board and oversees the local implementation of the budget; oversees implementation of the school marketing and enrollment plans directed by K12 to achieve and maintain enrollment capacity; serves as public relations liaison between K12 and the school community; engages community and civic groups to support school programs and the school community; effectively recruits, hires, and retains highly qualified staff; develops effective staff members through an ongoing evaluation process and professional development; creates and fosters a positive school culture by involving school staff, community leaders, students and parents; Serves as the school's instructional leader and ensures data is being used to drive all academic decisions.</p>
White, Bridget	Other	<p>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.</p>
Aleobua, Agnes	Other	<p>Agnes Aleobua serves as the school's Director of Academics. Ms Aleobua is responsible for developing and implementing educational policies and programs, and ensuring that they are carried out appropriately by all students, parents, and staff. She also develops and oversees the implementation of the academic and school improvement plan; develops and implements programs to ensure data is being used to drive academic decisions and is effectively analyzed to drive instructional practices across all grade levels and content areas; ensures teaching staff utilizes the K12 curriculum, effective assessments, and targeted instruction to meet the individual needs of each student; identifies and utilizes communication technologies and practices that most effectively support a predominantly virtual / remote work environment; and leads and manages leadership staff and department academic administrators/principals.</p>
Young, Leeanna	Other	Special Programs Manager
Hill, Traci	Other	Senior Manager for Operations and Compliance
Malo, Ryan	Principal	High School Principal

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Roache, Lindsey	Other	Middle School Principal
Sheffield, Samantha	Principal	
Whitten, Rita	Other	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	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
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	39	49	55	71	102	56	69	74	11	3	529

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	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	3	2	11	0	0	3	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

58

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/27/2019

Prior Year - 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 with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - 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	5	7	5	13	16	9	29	32	36	14	34	11	16	227
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	0	0	6	2	7	7	6	19	20	29	8	0	106
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	0	6	2	7	7	6	19	20	29	8	0	106

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	43%	54%	61%	40%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	59%	45%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	53%	54%	44%	47%	51%
Math Achievement	27%	57%	62%	20%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	36%	57%	59%	27%	52%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	52%	52%	34%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	34%	50%	56%	26%	47%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	57%	76%	78%	52%	76%	75%

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	
Number of students enrolled	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)
Attendance below 90 percent	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)
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	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)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	39 (0)	49 (0)	55 (0)	71 (0)	102 (0)	56 (0)	69 (0)	74 (0)	11 (0)	3 (0)	529 (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.
 NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	37%	51%	-14%	58%	-21%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	52%	-12%	58%	-18%
	2018	35%	49%	-14%	56%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	44%	50%	-6%	56%	-12%
	2018	25%	51%	-26%	55%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
06	2019	35%	47%	-12%	54%	-19%
	2018	30%	44%	-14%	52%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
07	2019	41%	44%	-3%	52%	-11%
	2018	33%	41%	-8%	51%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	51%	49%	2%	56%	-5%
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	58%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	39%	48%	-9%	55%	-16%
	2018	39%	48%	-9%	53%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
10	2019	42%	48%	-6%	53%	-11%
	2018	29%	49%	-20%	53%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	12%	61%	-49%	62%	-50%
	2018	30%	59%	-29%	62%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	27%	64%	-37%	64%	-37%
	2018	13%	60%	-47%	62%	-49%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	22%	57%	-35%	60%	-38%
	2018	16%	61%	-45%	61%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
06	2019	15%	51%	-36%	55%	-40%
	2018	16%	42%	-26%	52%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
07	2019	40%	47%	-7%	54%	-14%
	2018	23%	50%	-27%	54%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		24%				
08	2019	20%	32%	-12%	46%	-26%
	2018	20%	31%	-11%	45%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	28%	49%	-21%	53%	-25%
	2018	20%	56%	-36%	55%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	25%	40%	-15%	48%	-23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	29%	44%	-15%	50%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	67%	-20%	67%	-20%
2018	50%	63%	-13%	65%	-15%
Compare		-3%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	69%	-22%	71%	-24%
2018	35%	84%	-49%	71%	-36%
Compare		12%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	68%	-8%	70%	-10%
2018	63%	64%	-1%	68%	-5%
Compare		-3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	57%	-27%	61%	-31%
2018	30%	61%	-31%	62%	-32%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	31%	61%	-30%	57%	-26%
2018	36%	57%	-21%	56%	-20%
Compare		-5%			

Subgroup Data

2019 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	37	33	19	21	7	26	33			
BLK	40	49	32	16	29	34	17	50			
HSP	44	53	42	23	37	54	36	52			
MUL	42	47		21	44						
WHT	44	51	49	31	36	38	40	59	36		
FRL	37	47	35	20	38	41	32	55	55	27	

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
SWD	10	50		9	19		17				
BLK	39	46		14	28	33		44			
HSP	44	37		13	33		31				
MUL	47	36		31	20						
WHT	38	48	48	24	26	31	34	61	40		
FRL	37	39	38	16	24	27	22	58			

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	43
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Mathematics in all grade levels and Grade 3 in ELA showed the lowest performance. In 2018-19, there were many contributing and interrelated factors, both internal and external, that contributed to low performance in grade 3. These include: lack of curricula goal attainment, not using formative assessment data with fidelity, inconsistent implementation of small group, targeted instruction and student cohort background.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Grade 3 in ELA and mathematics showed the lowest decline year over year. Curriculum alignment, not using formative assessment data with fidelity, inconsistent implementation of small group, targeted instruction and instructional quality combined with a change in rigor may have contributed to the declines experienced this year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Mathematics in all levels have the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Again, curriculum alignment and instructional quality combined with a change in rigor may have contributed to the declines experienced this year.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

There greatest same grade gains were seen in grade 5 and 10 ELA and grade 7 math for same grade and cohort comparisons. The teacher quality in these grades levels made the difference.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The FLCCA leadership team must and will focus its energy, efforts, resources and data practices on the areas of mathematics and ELA, schoolwide.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Curriculum alignment to State Standards
2. Daily instructional mapping to curriculum
3. Targeted, small group and flex instruction

- 4. Formative assessment with NWEA
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Mathematics - All Tested Grade Levels
Rationale	The data shows mathematics at all levels is a critical need. FLCCA students are under performing compared to YoY in same grade comparison, cohort comparison, district and state.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In 2019-2020, FLCCA mathematics students will show increased proficiency and growth gains to a minimum of 50% in all state tested areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Agnes Aleobua (aaleobua@k12.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will receive ongoing instructional support to implement instructional maps, differentiate for small group, targeted instruction, formative assessment using NWEA Growth Maps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If all teachers of mathematics use data to drive instruction, and work collaboratively to plan and implement, highly engaging, differentiated instruction, then all learners will advance their grade level demonstrating at least a year's worth of growth.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By June 2020, monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction. 2. By June 2020, provide school-based coaching support to improve instruction. 3. By June 2020, monitor implementation of daily small group, differentiated instruction practices. 4. By June 2020, adapt SEL and Kagan strategies to a virtual learning environment to increase student engagement. 5. By June 2020, implementation of student data trackers, MOST, using NWEA Growth and USA Test Prep. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Agnes Aleobua (aaleobua@k12.com)

#2	
Title	English Language Arts - All Tested Grades
Rationale	The data shows ELA at all levels is in need of improvement. FLCCA students are under performing compared to YoY in same grade comparison, cohort comparison, district and state.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In 2019-2020, FLCCA ELA students will show increased proficiency and growth gains to a minimum of 50% in all state tested areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Agnes Aleobua (aaleobua@k12.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will receive ongoing instructional support to implement instructional maps, differentiate for small group, targeted instruction, formative assessment using NWEA Growth Maps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If all teachers of English Language Arts use data to drive instruction, and work collaboratively to plan and implement highly engaging, differentiated instruction, then all learners will advance their grade level demonstrating at least a year's worth of growth.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By June 2020, monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based instruction 2. By June 2020, provide school-based coaching support 3. By June 2020, implement daily small group, differentiated instruction practices. 4. By June 2020, adapt SEL and Kagan strategies to a virtual learning environment to increase student engagement 5. By June 2020, implement student data trackers using NWEA Growth and USA Test Prep.
Person Responsible	Agnes Aleobua (aaleobua@k12.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Resources: Curriculum and Instructional Maps, Instructional Coaches, NWEA, Stride, Big Universe, K12 teaching and learning supports.

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Mathematics - All Tested Grade Levels	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: English Language Arts - All Tested Grades	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00