

Florida Virtual School

# Florida Virtual Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Florida Virtual Elementary School

5422 CARRIER DR., Orlando, FL 32819

www.flvsft.com

## Demographics

**Principal: Sico Sheri**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/24/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: B (61%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the FL Virtual 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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Florida Virtual Elementary School

5422 CARRIER DR., Orlando, FL 32819

www.flvsft.com

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">47%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">49%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Grade</b>	C	C	C	C

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the FL Virtual 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.**

FLVS Full Time Elementary schools mission is to help each student maximize his or her potential and meet the highest performance standards through a uniquely individualized learning program.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our vision is for teachers, students, and parents to be empowered to create a safe, engaging, positive, and supportive student-centered environment. In this collaborative setting they are respected, motivated, and challenged through authentic learning embedded in a relevant and rigorous curriculum. Positive communication will be used to foster efficacy and interest in life-long learning.

### 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
Rummler, Marc	Principal	Oversee the entire operation of the school. Directly supervises assistant principals, guidance counselors and intervention team.
Sico, Sheri	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises teachers in grades 3, 4 and 5, and Physical Education.
Deas, Dari	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises teachers in grades K, 1 and 2, as well as Art, Spanish and Computer Science.

### 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	124	119	156	165	208	270	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1042
Attendance below 90 percent	5	1	1	1	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	1	1	3	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	56	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

**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	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**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	2	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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)**

43

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

Tuesday 9/24/2019

**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	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in ELA or Math	6	5	15	30	26	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
-------------------------------	---	---	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	129	144	208	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	481
---------------------------------	---	---	---	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

	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	1	2	30	26	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**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	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in ELA or Math	6	5	15	30	26	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
-------------------------------	---	---	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	129	144	208	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	481
---------------------------------	---	---	---	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

	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	1	2	30	26	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

**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	65%	65%	57%	63%	0%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	58%	54%	0%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	45%	53%	50%	0%	52%
Math Achievement	38%	38%	63%	39%	0%	61%
Math Learning Gains	32%	32%	62%	30%	0%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	26%	51%	30%	0%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	60%	53%	49%	0%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	124 (0)	119 (0)	156 (0)	165 (0)	208 (0)	270 (0)	1042 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 (0)	1 (1)	1 (2)	1 (0)	8 (1)	20 (1)	36 (5)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 (6)	1 (5)	1 (15)	3 (30)	2 (26)	7 (23)	15 (105)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (129)	56 (144)	81 (208)	142 (481)

**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	60%	60%	0%	58%	2%
	2018	65%	65%	0%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	67%	0%	58%	9%
	2018	65%	65%	0%	56%	9%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	66%	66%	0%	56%	10%
	2018	63%	63%	0%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	33%	33%	0%	62%	-29%
	2018	52%	52%	0%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	40%	0%	64%	-24%
	2018	48%	48%	0%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	41%	41%	0%	60%	-19%
	2018	49%	49%	0%	61%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	59%	0%	53%	6%
	2018	58%	58%	0%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

**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	38	36	31	26	37	36	31				
ELL	78	85		37	23						
BLK	56	52	50	31	31	21	36				
HSP	72	62	50	38	31	29	63				
MUL	67	50		35	25						
WHT	63	53	40	40	35	25	62				
FRL	60	57	53	32	35	25	47				

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
SWD	48	44	41	45	43	17	47				
ELL	45	38		29	33						
ASN	75	50		75	50		50				
BLK	49	44	45	36	30	28	40				
HSP	70	59	31	47	38	28	57				
MUL	66	48	38	47	27	18	69				
WHT	64	52	37	54	44	29	60				
FRL	57	51	36	40	32	21	47				
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	33	32	36	26	25	29	19				
ELL	20			8							
ASN	87	83		64	54		60				
BLK	51	50	61	23	22	23	31				
HSP	66	54	50	38	29	24	49				
MUL	61	63	58	39	41	36	38				
WHT	62	52	46	42	30	34	53				
FRL	55	49	48	30	27	26	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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	321
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	40
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	49
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	44
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	45
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	44
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.

FSA Math scores were low in all areas - Math Achievement, Math Learning Gains, and Math Learning Gains of Bottom 25%. School data collected throughout the year did not indicate the scores would be this low. The curriculum used during the 2018-19 school year was implemented for the first time. The school was in its first year being totally operated by FLVS and 91% of the K-5 teachers had never taught elementary students in an online environment.

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

This was the first year the elementary school was totally operated by FLVS. In comparison to Connections Academy, where FLVS students attended during the 2017-18 school year, Math Achievement level declined by an overall 12%, with 3rd grade showing this largest decline at 19%. New curriculum and the inexperience of the teachers delivering content and monitoring progress in an online environment were factors contributing to the decline.

#### 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.

Third grade students scored 29% below the state average in Math Achievement. As stated above, new curriculum, unreliable data, and teacher experience all contributed to this significant gap between school and state FSA scores.

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

Fifth grade students showed 3% increase in ELA Achievement. Since it was the first year for the school, new curriculum, teachers and schedules were all newly implemented from the prior year.

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

The number of students scoring on Level 1 on FSA is a concern. School personnel must identify these students early, provide appropriate support, and monitor progress frequently.

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

1. Math Achievement Level
2. Math Learning Gains of Lowest 25%

- 3. Math Learning Gains
- 4. ELA Learning Gains of Lowest 25%

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	To increase student achievement as measured by Math FSA
<b>Rationale</b>	In 2019, 3rd grade students scored 29% below the state average, 4th grade students scored 24% below the state average, and 5th grade students scored 19% below the state average in Math.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Student achievement, as measured by the 2020 Math FSA, will show an overall increase of 5%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The implementation of curriculum to ensure comprehension of grade-level math standards.</li> <li>2. The implementation of additional resources to ensure mastery of math standards.</li> <li>3. The development of a highly trained staff.</li> </ol> <p>Strategy 1: A gap was identified in the exposure to FSA tested standard rigor. Student performance on FSA Math did not match that of performance on course module exams.</p> <p>Strategy 2: Students working in an environment where direct instruction is not provided daily, they require relevant and engaging resources in order to master essential skills.</p> <p>Strategy 3: Students must be provided with highly trained teachers in the area of mathematics to ensure the delivery of instruction and the content being taught rises to the level students need in order to be successful. Due to the teachers being new to online teaching, providing training is essential for students to receive the necessary instruction.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<p>Strategy 1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meet with Curriculum Department personnel to identify gaps in curriculum.</li> <li>2. Appoint a focus group of teachers to work with Curriculum Department personnel to revise curriculum.</li> <li>3. Increase the amount of time of math live lessons in grades 3 - 5 per by 20% per week.</li> <li>4. Develop module review tests to be implemented in a proctored environment to obtain reliable data.</li> <li>5. Develop and implement math fluency tests and common assessments to further progress monitor students.</li> </ol> <p>Strategy 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assign specific Math iReady lessons to students based on their needs.</li> <li>2. Mail FSA workbooks to students for teachers to assign lessons and review during live lessons.</li> </ol> <p>Strategy 3:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide professional development for teachers in math instruction during staff</li> </ol>

meetings.

2. Provide opportunity for teachers, as selected by administrators, to share best practices in math instruction during staff meetings and face-to-face meetings.
3. Provide a series of math workshops by math intervention teacher.
4. Train teachers in the development of Tier 2 curriculum.
5. Provide opportunity for select teachers to attend the Florida Council of Teachers of Mathematics Conference.

**Person  
Responsible**

Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)

---



<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	To increase learning gains of the lowest 25% as measured by ELA FSA
<b>Rationale</b>	In 2019, 45% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains which is 8% below the state average.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Students in the lowest 25%, as measured by the 2020 ELA FSA, will show an increase of 3% in learning gains.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The implementation of differentiated instruction and scaffolded curriculum to identified students.</li> <li>2. The implementation of additional resources to ensure mastery of reading standards.</li> </ol>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Strategy 1: Based on the gap between the learning gains of all students and those in the lowest 25%, there is a need to ensure these at-risk students are receiving beneficial curriculum and instruction. As a first year school with a new curriculum, student identification of supports to implement will improve through new methods of identification and monitoring.</p> <p>Strategy 2: Students working in an environment where direct instruction is not provided daily, they require relevant and engaging resources in order to master essential skills.</p>
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<p>Strategy 1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify the lowest 30% of students to be closely monitored.</li> <li>2. Develop a "baseball card" of all data for these students for all staff to access, analyze, and monitor.</li> <li>3. Schedule weekly data chats with teachers to ensure students are being provided necessary instruction.</li> <li>4. Create lessons and common assessments by Lead Teachers to provide rigorous lessons and to obtain reliable data.</li> <li>5. Increase the amount of time of ELA live lessons in grades 3 - 5 by 20% per week.</li> <li>6. Include these students in the monthly discussion during the Classroom Walk-Through process.</li> <li>7. Provide the necessary courses for all K-5 teachers to become Reading Endorsed.</li> </ol> <p>Strategy 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assign specific Reading iReady lessons to students based on their needs.</li> <li>2. Mail FSA workbooks to students for teachers to assign lessons and review during live lessons.</li> <li>3. Train teachers in the use of NearPod to develop engaging lessons.</li> <li>4. Begin Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups by the second week of school.</li> <li>5. Begin tutoring groups by the third week of school.</li> <li>6. Provide Family Literacy Nights to educate and provide resources for parents to assist their children.</li> </ol>

**Person Responsible** Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)

**#3**

**Title** To increase the achievement of Students with Disabilities (SWD) as measured by FSA

**Rationale** In 2019, Students with Disabilities (SWD) were below the Federal Percent of Points Index by 7%.

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** Students with Disabilities (SWD) will meet or exceed the Federal Percent of Points Index of 41% as measured by the 2020 FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome** Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy** 1. The implementation of an instructional model to effectively deliver instruction and monitor progress.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** Strategy 1: During the 2018-19 school year, Students with Disabilities (SWD) were served in general education classes only. A push-in model was utilized. For the 2019-2020 school year, Students with Disabilities (SWD) will be supported by an improved model of support through identification of gaps from the 2018-19 school year

**Action Step**

**Description** Strategy 1:  
 1. Identify all Students with Disabilities (SWD) within the first week of school and notify all teachers.  
 2. Develop a new Unique Skills class for Students with Disabilities (SWD) to get extra support.  
 3. Provide weekly training by district personnel for all ESE personnel in utilizing tools to gather and analyze data.  
 4. Conduct weekly SST (Student Support Team) meetings to monitor progress of students.  
 5. Conduct weekly meeting with ESE teacher and principal to discuss student progress and curriculum development.  
 6. Create a "baseball card" data collection system to better monitor progress of these students.  
 7. Provide additional support to these students as needed via Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups.

**Person Responsible** Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)

<b>#4</b>	
<b>Title</b>	To increase the achievement of Black/African-American students as measured by FSA
<b>Rationale</b>	In 2019, Black/African-American students were below the Federal Percent of Points Index by 1%.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Black/African-American students will meet or exceed the Federal Percent of Points Index of 41% as measured by the 2020 FSA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	1. The implementation of appropriate instruction to identified students.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Strategy 1: In an online environment, teachers do not have the ability to see their students face-to-face. Through identification methods implemented for the 2019-20 school year, teachers have a greater understanding of their student population, including subgroup populations.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<p>Strategy 1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify Black/African-American students and notify all teachers.</li> <li>2. Include a Black/African-American identifier on the data collection "baseball card".</li> <li>3. Ensure Black/African-American at-risk students are discussed during data meetings, Classroom Walk-Throughs, and weekly SST meetings.</li> <li>4. Provide appropriate interventions to Black/African-American students.</li> <li>5. Mail FSA workbooks to students for teachers to assign and review lessons.</li> <li>6. Assign specific iReady Reading and Math lessons when needed.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)

**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.**

Parent and family engagement is a centerpiece of the FLVS FT Elementary School model and is integral to improving student academic achievement. Parent and family engagement is also underscored in the Learning Coach Agreement which every parent must sign when enrolling their child. Each FLVS FT student has a Learning Coach, a parent or other responsible adult designated by the parents, who works with him or her in person, under the guidance of a Florida-certified professional teacher. Whether a parent's role is a Learning Coach, or as someone providing oversight to the Learning Coach, all parents and guardians are intimately familiar with their child's progress on a day-to-day basis. The Learning Coaches are directly involved with students' day-to-day learning.

FLVS FT Elementary believes in involving parents in all aspects of its Title I programs. These programs will be planned and operated with meaningful consultation with parents of participating children, including the school-parent compact. The SAC has the responsibility of evaluating the various district and school level plans, including the SIP and the PFEPs. More than 50% of the members of the SAC are parent (non-employee), representatives. All parents are given the opportunity to review the plan and offer their input prior to approval. The PFEP was sent to all parents via webmail (with a read receipt, read required specification) and placed on the Family Resource Center.

Parents were also provided with the Parent Satisfaction Survey at the end of the school year requesting their input regarding curriculum, parent involvement activities, school communication, and student achievement. As a result of the information shared from parents on the 2018-19 survey, the school has adopted the Leader-In-Me Program. This program establishes a "whole-child" mindset with the belief that all students can be leaders.

#### **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.**

FLVS Full Time Elementary ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met by providing brief individual counseling to students who have been identified as being a "student in distress" or who have been referred as a student concern by their teacher or parent. School Counselors provide social-emotional sessions open to all students. Students who have been identified, are monitored throughout the year by a school administrator and/or teacher with regular phone calls to the student and caretaker. Many student cases are also reviewed by our Exceptional Student Education Department as a proactive way to determine if a student may need additional services. All staff members are trained annually on how to recognize and respond to students in distress.

Personnel from multiple departments are members of the Threat Assessment Team (TAT). Members are trained to recognize and react accordingly to problems. Monthly meetings are conducted to ensure the well-being of the students.

All students at FLVS Full Time Elementary are given the opportunity to attend social meetups that are held regularly throughout the state. These events are for academic extension outside of FLVS FT and support student's social-emotional needs. Students are also invited to participate in virtual clubs and activities that will also aid in the development of the student's social being. Finally, for students who are transitioning from elementary to middle school, a live lesson is held to help ease the transition prior to the end of school year.

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

At FLVS FT, the goal is for students to be transitioned from one grade level to another by providing a rigorous, developmentally-appropriate curriculum in an engaging virtual environment. An on-boarding

course was developed for new families and returning families to aid in a successful transition to the next grade level. Welcome sessions are held by all teachers in order to familiarize parents with school requirements, grade-level standards, and objectives, and to assist with establishing consistent learning routines. The fifth grade teachers host a transition each spring in partnership with the middle school. These sessions provide information on students moving to middle school and explain academic and school requirements at those new levels.

**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.**

FLVS Full Time Elementary uses the Problem Solving/Response to Intervention method of developing and implementing research-based instruction and interventions based on a three-tiered model. The RtI model used integrates core instruction (Tier-1), supplemental instruction/interventions (Tier-2), and intensive interventions (Tier-3).

Prior to enrollment, each student's academic data is reviewed including state test scores, curriculum-based measurements and assessments, and prior report card(s). Kindergarten students complete a 1:1 screening assessment prior to school starting. Students in K-2 are given a reading and math fluency test within the first 30 days of enrollment. Students in grades 3-5 are also given a reading and math fluency test as well as a diagnostic test in ELA and Math in iReady within the first 30 days of school. All data is analyzed, and interventions in the student's greatest area of need will be assigned. Student progress is continuously monitored, students scoring below grade level will be referred to the Student Support Team (SST).

Tier-1 instruction includes weekly monitoring of academic performance within the curriculum and live lesson attendance. Additionally, parents and students receive a monthly academic performance phone call. Tier-2 of FLVS Full Time RtI consists of supplemental instruction/interventions used in addition to Tier-1 core instruction and live lesson participation and managed by the teachers and RtI Specialist. Grades K-2 are focusing on the foundations of reading and math standards, grade 3-5 are focusing on training standards. Tier-3 is comprised of intensive interventions in addition to the core academic curriculum and supplemental program(s). Parents and the SST meet and review student progress. Targeted intensive interventions for academic concerns are developed and implemented. Progress monitoring occurs at least three times per month.

FLVS FT team will coordinate Title I, Part A and Title II, Part A funds to provide supplement professional development activities to teachers and staff.

**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 K-5 grade levels only

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A. Areas of Focus: To increase student achievement as measured by Math FSA	\$0.00
---	--	--------

2	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: To increase learning gains of the lowest 25% as measured by ELA FSA</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
3	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: To increase the achievement of Students with Disabilities (SWD) as measured by FSA</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
4	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: To increase the achievement of Black/African-American students as measured by FSA</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>