Alachua Eschool (Virtual Franchise)

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Alachua Eschool (Virtual Franchise)

2802 NE 8TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

https://www.sbac.edu/aes

Demographics

Principal: J ESE Ly Alvarez Masencup

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
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)	51%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: I (%) 2017-18: I (%) 2016-17: I (%) 2015-16: C (52%) 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 is pending approval by the Alachua County School Board.

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.](http://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

Alachua Eschool (Virtual Franchise)

2802 NE 8TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

https://www.sbac.edu/aes

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	No	33%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	31%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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.

The mission of The Alachua eSchool is to develop and deliver stndards-based, student-centered online courses that increase educational opportunities and 21st century skills, and to provide professional development to educators that expand the scope and depth of their instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to be the district leader in online education by working collaboratively with mddie and high schools to offer the highest quality courses for students and teachers.

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
Stefansen, Ed	Principal	The instructional leader is responsible for setting clear goals, allcoating resources to instruction, managing the curriculum, evaluating teachers, promotes growth in student learning, meets with staff members on a regular basis, work together to problem solve, set high expectations for performance, create a culture for continuous leanring, modeling effective instruction, support collaboration, and give praise for effective teaching.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	11	8	11	7	8	10	67
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	3	2	3	2	2	12

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

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
10

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 7/25/2019

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	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 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	

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	0%	59%	56%	0%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	52%	51%	0%	54%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	39%	42%	0%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	54%	51%	0%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	54%	48%	0%	41%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	48%	45%	0%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	68%	68%	0%	65%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	75%	73%	0%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	12 (0)	11 (0)	8 (0)	11 (0)	7 (0)	8 (0)	10 (0)	67 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	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)	3 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	12 (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
06	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	82%	54%	28%	52%	30%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		82%				
Cohort Comparison		82%				
08	2019	73%	61%	12%	56%	17%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		73%				
Cohort Comparison		73%				
09	2019	0%	60%	-60%	55%	-55%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	52%	-52%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	60%	59%	1%	54%	6%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		60%				
Cohort Comparison		60%				
08	2019	0%	27%	-27%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	24%	-24%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	43%	54%	-11%	48%	-5%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		43%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	68%	-68%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	69%	1%	71%	-1%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	69%	-69%	71%	-71%
Compare		70%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	71%	8%	70%	9%
2018	0%	71%	-71%	68%	-68%
Compare		79%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	27%	56%	-29%	61%	-34%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Compare		27%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	33%	48%	-15%	57%	-24%
2018	0%	63%	-63%	56%	-56%
Compare		33%			

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
WHT	78	71		45	55					57	
FRL										50	
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

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	366
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	75%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	61
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	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

The eSchool had low performance in the Geometry EOC from the prior year. FLVS changed the version of the course and I feel that the older verison did not have all of the necessary components to prepare students for the EOC. Also, students may not reach out to the instructors when needing support.

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

Geometry EOC also had the greatest decline from the prior year. I do feel that the majority of the students taking the Geometry EOC were not prepared.

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.

8th grade science seemed to show the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Virtual students tend to focus more on language arts and math and less on science an social studies.

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

7th grade had the most improvement in language arts in comparison to the state. We did not have data from the prior year to see a gain.

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

Are biggest area of concern is percent tested. We focused greatly on student contact, mandatory testing, and communication with the school on being present.

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

1. Increase graduation rate for students assigned to Alachua eSchool.
2. Increase percent tested at the secondary level during the testing window.
3. Understand the process for co enrollment and have that tested before the amendment period is up after Survey 3.
4. Increase course completions.
5. Increase communication at the secondary schools with student enrollment.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase graduation rate for Alachua eSchool
Rationale	Each year the Alachua eSchool falls short for earning a school grade due to our low graduation rate.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	A comprehensive plan will be established for students enrolling with the Alachua eSchool who come from other schools in the district who are credit deficit or who have failed state testing. Pace charts will be created for students to provide a visual component for staying on task. More time will be spent on observing students abilities in achieving completion in their online courses along with online instructors providing feedback of progress to both parents and students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ed Stefansen (stefanem@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Achievable objects must be set by their online instructors along with monthly goals that prepare them for meaningful DBA's (Discussion Based Assessments).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If students are aware of their monthly goals and prepared to effectively complete a DBA, online instructors will see that comprehension has taken place to prepare students for the next module. https://www.flvs.net/docs/default-source/district/flvs-instructor-evaluation-plan.pdf

Action Step	
Description	1. Readiness 2. Motivation 3. Achievable goals for completing the course 4. Monthly goals 5. Effective DBA's
Person Responsible	Ed Stefansen (stefanem@gm.sbac.edu)

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).

Additional support needed for students success also comes from school support with the hiring of effective virtual lab proctors. Lab proctors are instructed to provide a meaningful learning environment for students by making sure they stay on task and use the lab time wisely. They should communicate regularly with the online instructors to point out students who may be struggling or who have fallen behind in pace.

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.

NA

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.

NA

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

NA

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.

NA

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

NA

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase graduation rate for Alachua eSchool	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00