

Putnam County School District

Putnam Virtual Franchise



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 | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Putnam Virtual Franchise

200 REID ST, Palatka, FL 32177

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Mary Wood

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2010

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 41% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: F (26%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade |
| 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 Putnam County School Board on 11/5/2019.

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 | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Putnam Virtual Franchise

200 REID ST, Palatka, FL 32177

[no web address on file]

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 | 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 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
| Grade | C | F | C |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/5/2019.

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.

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 | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------|------------------------|--|
| Hough, Renee | Administrative Support | Renee Hough serves as the school administrator for Putnam Virtual Franchise. Her duties include: reviewing the contract with NEFEC to provide a virtual instruction program; planning, overseeing, and approving all budgets, expenditures, and invoices for services from NEFEC; supervising the PVF facilitator/guidance counselor and registrar, reviewing applicants for enrollment, meets with the PVF guidance counselor regularly for a progress monitoring report, and makes decisions about open enrollment periods for the school. |
| Burney, Amanda | School Counselor | Amanda Burney serves as the Guidance Counselor/Facilitator for the Putnam Virtual Franchise. Her duties include: planning and conducting enrollment meetings with students and parents, development of an enrollment process, a handbook, and a school calendar specialized to the virtual program, counsels students and parents on promotion requirements, graduation requirements, course selection, etc., verifies enrollment in courses for all PVF students, maintains a record of progress for each PVF student and makes regular progress check contact with students and parents, makes sure students and parents are aware of educational opportunities in our district like PSAT, College and Career Night, etc., conducts Mandatory Orientation meetings for enrolled students, plans and conducts Parent Nights once a semester for virtual students and parents, serves as school testing coordinator, organizes school testing calendar, makes sure students and parents know testing dates and locations, trains staff for testing, maintains necessary testing database requirements for state testing, conducts state testing, acts as liaison between students and the NEFEC partner MDVS, maintains physical/cumulative records for students, conducts dual enrollment testing for students that have qualifying GPAs. |
| Owens, Stacy | Registrar | Stacey Owens serves as the Registrar for Putnam Virtual Franchise. Her duties include: enrolling all students into the Skyward database, making sure all students have appropriate enrollment records, enters all transcripts from previous schools into the Skyward database, regularly review the enrollment report submitted by MDVS, create all student schedules based on their enrollment and make sure they are reported correctly, enter all teacher demographics and create a staff profile in Skyward for each instructor, post all completed course grades, ensures EOC scores have been posted and calculated correctly, produces all transcripts, submits all transcripts of students to Bright Futures and Talented 20, maintains attendance records for all students, creates report cards for students, and submits records requests to previous schools and completes records requests for transferring students. |

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 | 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 | 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 | 0 |
| 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)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/30/2019

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 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 50% | 68% | 61% | 64% | 73% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 42% | 52% | 59% | 70% | 64% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 0% | 63% | 54% | 0% | 48% | 51% |
| Math Achievement | 42% | 57% | 62% | 36% | 47% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 0% | 50% | 59% | 27% | 33% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 0% | 40% | 52% | 0% | 36% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 0% | 83% | 56% | 0% | 89% | 53% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 0% | 93% | 78% | 0% | 98% | 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) | 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.

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% | 42% | -42% | 54% | -54% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 42% | -42% | 52% | -52% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 0% | 38% | -38% | 52% | -52% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 38% | -38% | 51% | -51% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 0% | 41% | -41% | 56% | -56% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 47% | -47% | 58% | -58% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 09 | 2019 | 0% | 41% | -41% | 55% | -55% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 38% | -38% | 53% | -53% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 0% | 41% | -41% | 53% | -53% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 38% | -38% | 53% | -53% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| 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% | 45% | -45% | 55% | -55% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 47% | -47% | 52% | -52% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 0% | 33% | -33% | 54% | -54% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 25% | -25% | 54% | -54% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 0% | 16% | -16% | 46% | -46% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 16% | -16% | 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% | 14% | -14% | 48% | -48% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 20% | -20% | 50% | -50% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 67% | -67% |
| 2018 | 0% | 58% | -58% | 65% | -65% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 60% | -60% | 71% | -71% |
| 2018 | 0% | 60% | -60% | 71% | -71% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 51% | -51% | 70% | -70% |
| 2018 | 0% | 53% | -53% | 68% | -68% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 49% | -49% | 61% | -61% |
| 2018 | 0% | 43% | -43% | 62% | -62% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 43% | -43% | 57% | -57% |
| 2018 | 0% | 50% | -50% | 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 | 58 | 50 | | 45 | | | | | | | |

| 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 | | | | | | | |

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 | 48 |
| 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 | 192 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 4 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |

| 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 |
| 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 | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 51 |
| 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 | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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.

Learning Gains in ELA and Mathematics were the lowest components. ELA learning gains were 42% and Mathematics learning gains were 0%. Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% were 0% in both ELA and Mathematics.

The graduation rate of 58% is also a low component of concern.

Online learning is not an effective learning platform for all students. Additional supports are needed to ensure students are making adequate progress.

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

Mathematics learning gains decreased from 10% in 2018 to 0% in 2019.

All level 1 students and low level 2's were enrolled in Intensive math on OdysseyWare. Students did not complete the remedial course. Intensive mathematics is currently not offered through My District Virtual school or Florida Virtual School.

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 learning gains had the largest gap when compared to the state average. The state average is 48% and Putnam Virtual's average is 0%.

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

ELA Achievement was the component with the most improvement. 2018 ELA Achievement was 29% and 2019 ELA Achievement was 50%.

All ELA level 1's and the lowest performing level 2's were enrolled in intensive reading through My District Virtual. All students successfully completed the course.

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

EWS Data is not applicable.

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

1. Graduation Rate
2. Mathematics Learning Gains
3. ELA Learning Gains
4. Mathematics Achievement
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| | |
|---|--|
| #1 | |
| Title | School Graduation Rate and Off-Track Students |
| Rationale | Putnam Virtual Franchise's graduation rate is 58% . Mathematics learning gains is 0%, ELA learning Gains is 42%. These components fall well below the state average. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The graduation rate will increase to above 67%. Student learning gains in ELA and Mathematics will increase to the State Average. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Renee Hough (rthough@my.putnamschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Providing additional supports and monitoring of students to meet graduation requirements and remediation in ELA and Mathematics will increase student FSA performance and the graduation rate. The graduation rate is 58% and student learning gains in ELA and Mathematics are well below the state average. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Providing additional supports to students and monitoring their progress is a necessary strategy due to the limitations of the online platform. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing students practice materials for ACT/SAT 2. College and career focused field trips for students and their parents 3. Home visits for parent conferences 4. Purchasing computers for student testing 5. Provide tutoring for students 6. Partially fund guidance counselor 7. Pay expenditures for SAT and or ACT student fees to give students additional opportunities to satisfy graduation requirements. 8. Mandatory student/parent nights each semester. 9. Mandatory orientation prior to school starting. 10. Individual student meetings to review data and course progression. 11. Students will be given an opportunity to take the PSAT and the SAT school day. |
| Person Responsible | Amanda Burney (a2burney@my.putnamschools.org) |

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 V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--|--------------|----------------|-----|-------------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: School Graduation Rate and Off-Track Students | | | | \$9,116.37 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|---------------------------------------|--|--------|---------------|-------------------|
| | 5100 | 644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized | 7004 - Putnam Virtual Franchise | UniSIG | | \$2,592.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Expenditures for computer hardware at Putnam Virtual Franchise to purchase 12 new student Chromebooks to use for student testing. Cost per laptop is \$185.00 plus the cost of the Google Chrome Management Console License and the extended service is \$31 per laptop.</i> | | | |
| | 6150 | 390-Other Purchased Services | 7004 - Putnam Virtual Franchise | UniSIG | | \$3,750.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Expenditures for other purchased services including charter buses to provide students who attend Putnam Virtual Franchise and their parents with opportunities to attend college and career focused field trips.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 7004 - Putnam Virtual Franchise | UniSIG | | \$1,604.37 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Expenditures for instructional supplies at Putnam Virtual Franchise to support increasing the graduation rate including SAT and/or ACT study materials and Algebra 1 student workbooks.</i> | | | |
| | 6120 | 330-Travel | 7004 - Putnam Virtual Franchise | UniSIG | | \$500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Expenditures associated with travel (mileage) for the Putnam Virtual Franchise guidance counselor to conduct student home visits. Mileage reimbursement is the standard IRS rate per school board policy.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 730-Dues and Fees | 7004 - Putnam Virtual Franchise | UniSIG | | \$670.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Expenditures for 10 SAT and/or ACT testing fee waivers to provide students with additional opportunities to satisfy graduation requirements. The cost per waiver is approximately \$67.</i> | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$9,500.00 |