

The School Board of Highlands County

Highlands Virtual School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Highlands Virtual School

426 SCHOOL ST, Sebring, FL 33870

<https://sites.google.com/highlands.k12.fl.us/hvs>

Demographics

Principal: Page Green

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2019

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)	49%
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* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Highlands Virtual School

426 SCHOOL ST, Sebring, FL 33870

<https://sites.google.com/highlands.k12.fl.us/hvs>

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)
Combination School KG-12	No	54%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	C	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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.

Highlands Virtual students develop their intellectual abilities through the utilization of ever-evolving technologies supported by educators who understand the importance of fostering high standards of learning in an effort to produce productive members of society and good citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering students to embrace all-access learning and achieve their personal best.

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
Layfield, Lorie	Other	
Manley, Steven	Teacher, K-12	
Pierce, Margaret	Teacher, K-12	
Sinclair, Terri	Teacher, K-12	
Hunter, Rhonda	Teacher, K-12	
Siver, Juliet	Teacher, K-12	
Magrinat, Yuleivys	Teacher, K-12	

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	3	7	7	8	14	11	24	74
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	1	0	1

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)**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 9/23/2019

Prior Year - 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	1	0	1	0	0	2	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
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	2	1	0	0	1	1	5	

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	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
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	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	2	1	10

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	62%	62%	61%	0%	0%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	41%	41%	59%	0%	0%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	0%	54%	0%	0%	51%
Math Achievement	44%	44%	62%	0%	0%	58%
Math Learning Gains	36%	36%	59%	0%	0%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	0%	52%	0%	0%	50%
Science Achievement	55%	55%	56%	0%	0%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	63%	63%	78%	0%	0%	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)	3 (0)	7 (0)	7 (0)	8 (0)	14 (0)	11 (0)	24 (0)	74 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)
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 (1)	0 (0)	0 (1)
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)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (5)

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					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	44%	-44%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	0%	40%	-40%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	39%	-39%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	46%	-46%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	46%	-46%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	40%	-40%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	40%	43%	-3%	53%	-13%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		40%				
Cohort Comparison		40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	44%	-44%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	49%	-49%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	44%	-44%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	36%	-36%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	41%	-41%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	43%	-43%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	40%	54%	-14%	67%	-27%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	65%	-65%
Compare		40%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	60%	-60%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	63%	-5%	70%	-12%
2018	0%	63%	-63%	68%	-68%
Compare		58%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	52%	-52%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	53%	-53%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	65	54		46				54			
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
WHT	57	62		46							
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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
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	301
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98%
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	
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
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	55
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.

Math learning gains 36% -students need additional with foundational skills.

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

ELA learning gains declined 17%-progressing monitoring can be strengthened, additional support with time management and study skills.

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.

Science had a 13% gap-nature of science was problematic and an area to strengthen.

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

Math achievement showed improvement with a 4% increase from 40% to 44% - consistent instruction.

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

We will continue to monitor student participation.

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

1. ELA Learning gains
2. Math Learning Gains
3. Science Achievement
4. Social Studies Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Learning Gains ELA
Rationale	Learning Gains in ELA
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students in all sub groups will improve learning gains 3% in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Margaret Pierce (piercem1@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development provided to teachers on how to calculate learning gains. 2. Progress monitoring of standard mastery and pacing. 3. Continued alignment with SBHC curriculum maps through course customization. 4. Provide weekly progress reporting to parents as well as immediate access through guardian account.
Person Responsible	Lorie Layfield (layfiel@highlands.k12.fl.us)
#2	
Title	Learning Gains Math
Rationale	Learning Gains in Math
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students in all sub groups will improve learning gains 3% in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Terri Sinclair (sinclait@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development provided to teachers on how to calculate learning gains. 2. Progress monitoring of standard mastery and pacing. 3. Continued alignment with SBHC curriculum maps through course customization. 4. Provide weekly progress reporting to parents as well as immediate access through guardian account.
Person Responsible	Lorie Layfield (layfiel@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	Science Achievement levels in the 18-19 school year were below the district average by 1%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Science assessments Achievement level will improve by 3%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Steven Manley (manleys@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1. Progress monitoring of standard mastery and pacing. 2. Continued alignment with SBHC curriculum maps through course customization. 3. Provide weekly progress reporting to parents as well as immediate access through guardian account.
Person Responsible	Lorie Layfield (layfiel@highlands.k12.fl.us)
#4	
Title	Social Studies Achievement
Rationale	Social Studies Achievement levels in the 18-19 school year were below the district average by 2%
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Social Studies assessments Achievement level will improve by 3%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rhonda Hunter (hunterr@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1. Progress monitoring of standard mastery and pacing. 2. Continued alignment with SBHC curriculum maps through course customization. 3. Provide weekly progress reporting to parents as well as immediate access through guardian account.
Person Responsible	Lorie Layfield (layfiel@highlands.k12.fl.us)

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).

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.

HVS is not a Title 1 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.

HVS is not a Title 1 School.

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

HVS is not a Title 1 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.

HVS is not a Title 1 School.

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

HVS is not a Title 1 School.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Learning Gains ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Learning Gains Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Achievement	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Social Studies Achievement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00