Pinellas County Schools

# Pinellas Virtual Franchise

## 2020-21 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

Positive Culture & Environment 20

Budget to Support Goals 21

# Pinellas Virtual Franchise

305 4TH AVE SW, Largo, FL 33770

virtualschool.pcsb.org

## Demographics

### Principal: Mandy Perry

Start Date for this Principal: 7/5/2020

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Combination School<br>KG-12 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 20% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (66%)<br>2017-18: A (62%)<br>2016-17: No Grade<br>2015-16: No Grade |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Central |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Lucinda Thompson |
| **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 is pending approval by the Pinellas 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.

## 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** 21

# Pinellas Virtual Franchise

305 4TH AVE SW, Largo, FL 33770

virtualschool.pcsb.org

## School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Combination School KG-12 | No | 35% |

| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 36% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | A | A | A |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas 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.**

Expanding access for all Pinellas County students to rigorous, relevant curriculum that incorporates skills and knowledge students need to succeed in the 21st century.

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

100% Student Success

## School Leadership Team

**Membership**
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Perry, Mandy | Principal | *Facilitate implementation of MTSS process<br>*Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development<br>*Analyze student data to determine achievements and opportunities for growth<br>*Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS process<br>*Conduct live class observations to monitor the effectiveness of instruction |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Sunday 7/5/2020, Mandy Perry

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
3

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Combination School<br>KG-12 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 20% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (66%)<br>2017-18: A (62%)<br>2016-17: No Grade<br>2015-16: No Grade |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Central |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Lucinda Thompson |
| **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. | |

## 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 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 17 | 16 | 96 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 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 | |

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

Sunday 7/5/2020

**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 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 16 | 14 | 16 | 94 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |

**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 | 1 | 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 | |

**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 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 16 | 14 | 16 | 94 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |

**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 | 1 | 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 | |

## 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 | 73% | 70% | 61% | 0% | 65% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 60% | 63% | 59% | 0% | 57% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 58% | 56% | 54% | 0% | 52% | 51% |
| Math Achievement | 70% | 72% | 62% | 0% | 64% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 61% | 63% | 59% | 0% | 56% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 0% | 54% | 52% | 0% | 52% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 59% | 64% | 56% | 0% | 55% | 53% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 90% | 81% | 78% | 0% | 81% | 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 | |
| | (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.**

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 58% | -58% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 58% | -58% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 56% | -56% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 0% | 51% | -51% | 54% | -54% |
| | 2018 | 83% | 49% | 34% | 52% | 31% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -83% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 0% | 51% | -51% | 52% | -52% |
| | 2018 | 82% | 48% | 34% | 51% | 31% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -82% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -83% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 80% | 55% | 25% | 56% | 24% |
| | 2018 | 85% | 55% | 30% | 58% | 27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 09 | 2019 | 73% | 54% | 19% | 55% | 18% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 53% | -53% | 53% | -53% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 73% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 62% | 53% | 9% | 53% | 9% |
| | 2018 | 73% | 54% | 19% | 53% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 62% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 0% | 62% | -62% | 62% | -62% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 0% | 64% | -64% | 64% | -64% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 0% | 60% | -60% | 60% | -60% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 0% | 44% | -44% | 55% | -55% |
| | 2018 | 60% | 45% | 15% | 52% | 8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -60% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 0% | 60% | -60% | 54% | -54% |
| | 2018 | 88% | 59% | 29% | 54% | 34% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -88% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -60% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 55% | 31% | 24% | 46% | 9% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 31% | 28% | 45% | 14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -33% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 43% | 51% | -8% | 48% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 66% | 53% | 13% | 50% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -23% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 43% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School Minus District** | **State** | **School Minus State** |
| 2019 | 73% | 62% | 11% | 67% | 6% |
| 2018 | 82% | 63% | 19% | 65% | 17% |
| Compare | | -9% | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School Minus District** | **State** | **School Minus State** |
| 2019 | 90% | 68% | 22% | 71% | 19% |
| 2018 | 82% | 66% | 16% | 71% | 11% |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| Compare | | 8% | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 87% | 70% | 17% | 70% | 17% |
| 2018 | 81% | 70% | 11% | 68% | 13% |
| Compare | | 6% | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 85% | 55% | 30% | 61% | 24% |
| 2018 | 69% | 57% | 12% | 62% | 7% |
| Compare | | 16% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 75% | 56% | 19% | 57% | 18% |
| 2018 | 65% | 56% | 9% | 56% | 9% |
| Compare | | 10% | | | |

## 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 | 75 | 58 | | 69 | 60 | | 63 | 90 | 60 | | |
| FRL | 79 | 50 | | 67 | 64 | | | 91 | | | |

| 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 |
| HSP | 90 | 60 | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 83 | 73 | 83 | 73 | 53 | | 68 | 83 | 50 | | |
| FRL | 91 | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | 66 |
| 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 | 526 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| 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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| 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% | 0 |

| 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% | 0 |

| White Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - White Students | 68 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 70 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## 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.**

Our current level of performance of grade 6 math is 33%, as evidenced in school-wide FSA testing. This was a decrease of 27%. This has been a decreasing trend for the past 3 years. The problem/gap is occurring because of the lack of progress monitoring of the student’s skills.

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

Grade 8 science, Biology, Grade 6, and Grade 10 ELA showed the largest decline. This has been a 3-year trend in Grade 8 Science only. The problem/gap is occurring because of the lack of progress monitoring of the student's 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.**

Grade 6 math had the greatest gap compared to the state. The problem/gap is occurring because of the lack of progress monitoring of the student's skills.

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

Algebra and Civics showed the most improvement. There was an increase in this area because there was an increase in progress monitoring of student's skills.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

The area of concern would be the state tests went from a 73% passing rate to 71% as an average. We had only one student that exhibited concern from EWS data.

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

1. Middle School Math
2. Science
3. Middle and High school ELA
4. Graduation Rate
5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | If we effectively implement high-leverage strategies that support student-centered with rigor, then the percent of all student's success in all classes will increase from 71% to 76%.<br>Rationale<br>Grade 8 science, Biology, Grade 6, and Grade 10 ELA showed the largest decline. This has been a 3-year trend in Grade 8 Science only. The problem/ gap is occurring because of the progress monitoring of student's skills were not being implemented. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | The percent of all students achieving mathematics proficiency in grade 6 will increase from 33% to 43%, as measured by FSA tests. The percent of all students achieving proficiency in Grade 8 Science and Biology will increase from 58% to 68% as measured by FCAT and EOC tests. The percent of all students achieving proficiency in Grade 6 and Grade 10 ELA will increase from 69% to 75%. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Strengthening the staffs' ability to engage students in complex tasks. Strengthen staffs' practices to utilize questions to help students elaborate on content. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Make sure the staff is fully trained to assist students in acquiring skills to handle complex tasks. These strategies will increase opportunities for teachers to productively collaborate in analyzing student data and planning lessons to interact with new content or deepen the understanding of the content. Evidence of this completion will be found in the minutes of the PLC's and through Live lessons. |

| Action Steps to Implement | |
|---|---|
| Professional Learning on how to engage students in complex tasks in math, science, and ELA. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org) |
| Professional Learning on incorporating Data and DBA chats in math, science, and ELA. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org) |
| Professional Learning on face to face tutoring and progress monitoring in math, science, and ELA. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org) |

| #2. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | The percent of all students graduating on-time with their cohort will increase from 92.31% to 94%, as measured by the district's final graduation file.<br>Rationale-The problem/gap is occurring because this will be the third year to have a graduation. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Our current level of performance is 92.31%, as evidenced by our graduation rate.<br>We expect our performance level to be 94% by June 2021. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | 1. Intensify the graduation committee to focus on data to plan interventions and supports for individual students. 2. Strengthen staff practice to communicate and engage students and families in planning when students are not on track to graduate. 3. Strengthen staff ability to engage students for on-track promotion throughout high school. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | This will be only the third year that we will have graduation at our school. Since our current level of graduation was 92.31% this year, more focus will be needed on strengthening plans for intervention and support for our upcoming cohorts. These strategies will increase opportunities for teachers to productively collaborate in analyzing student data and planning lessons to interact with new content or deepen the understanding of the content. Students will be taught how to monitor their success of completion. Evidence will be found in the minutes of the PLC's and the SBLT and next year's graduation rate. |

| Action Steps to Implement | |
|---|---|
| Graduation Committee will be formed. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org) |
| Strategies will be discussed from the graduation committee and sub-committees will be formed to implement planned interventions. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org) |
| On-track progress monitoring is implemented by all teachers. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org) |

| #3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | The area of focus will be to address student and family engagement for the adoption of equitable practices.<br>Rationale- The use of the Racial Equity Analysis Protocol identifies this as an area of focus. This area of focus impacts student learning and success. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | To address student and family engagement for the adoption of equitable practice, we will actively seek voice from all stakeholders with explicit attention to the student and family demographics not currently represented by inviting and removing barriers for students and families to be a part of various committees such as SAC or NHS. Our current data illustrates that representation from minorities as evidenced by current SAC and NHS enrollment. The issue may be impacted by the perceptions of our families through sustained professional development. We will measure progress by recording the consistency of attendance and the diversity of opinions leading to decision making, family engagement surveys. We will measure medium-term outcomes by using family engagement surveys and report the change in rate of observable student and family engagement whose demographics were not previously represented. We will measure long-term student outcomes by examining minority participation with the goal of reducing the achievement gap. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Using the REAP tool we identified that the Equitable Voice (student and family engagement for the adoption of equitable practices). as the evidenced-based strategy. Strengthen staff practice to communicate and engage students and families in planning when students are not on track. Strengthen staff ability to engage students for on-track promotion throughout high school. Recruit more involvement in our SAC and NHS. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | These strategies were identified and selected based on the results of the REAP protocol. |

| Action Steps to Implement | |
|---|---|
| Committee formed to create surveys based on the REAP tool. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org) |
| Make sure all personal has participated in the county's training of Culturally Relevant Teaching. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org) |
| Form a committee on how to recruit a more diverse participants on our SAC and NHS. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org) |

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**N/A**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

To build a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved our plan is:
1. Create meaningful parent involvement- Generating clear, open communication with the parents of our students can help us avoid misunderstandings and remove feelings of mistrust or hostility. So to involve parents in our school culture, we will need to give them a platform for feedback on classroom activities or school programs. We will ask them about their hopes or concerns regarding their children's education. We will go beyond parent-teacher meetings and organize workshops where teachers and parents can discuss homework, study skills, and tests.
2. Celebrate personal achievement and good behavior- This means more than the occasional "good job." We will be complimenting students to help them feel that they are cared for individually. One way to assure staff generates more positive reinforcement is to set goals for the number of compliments each member has to give during the day or week. Encourage them to give specific compliments that highlight what each individual student has done well.
3. Establish school norms that build values- Our school and classroom rules are clear to all students, and are well-regulated. We have created school norms that focus on building positive values in our classes. This helps our students to learn, not just what they should and shouldn't do, but why they should or shouldn't do it.
4. Set consistent discipline- When rules are not followed, discipline must be administered. However, by broadening the range of discipline methods we help encourage a positive school culture. Instead of constantly putting out fires, we will try a more proactive approach to discipline.
5. Encourage innovation in the classroom- In our PLC's and team meetings, we will encourage teachers to try new methods of teaching. We can discuss new research on teaching methods or new teaching tech, and how these can be implemented in your school. These meetings will help the whole teaching staff to brainstorm and implement new ideas, bringing teachers into the process of building your school culture.
6. Professional development for teachers- We are continually encouraging teachers to build their craft through professional development.
7. Keep tabs on your school's culture, and make adjustments when necessary- we will do this using parent, student and staff surveys. we will set aside time every few months to analyze our school culture. We will keep on the watch for the specific factors that indicate a positive school culture, and keep using the steps above to reinforce those aspects. Also, we need to be aware of any negative factors that have started to seep in and take decisive action to remove those.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

## Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction** | | | | **$300.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 1110 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 7004 - Pinellas Virtual Franchise | School Improvement Funds | | $300.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Materials and awards for teachers and support personnel* | | | |
| **2** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team** | | | | **$500.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 3336 | | 7004 - Pinellas Virtual Franchise | School Improvement Funds | | $500.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Materials for elementary and science classes* | | | |
| **3** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity** | | | | **$400.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 2763 | 910-To General Fund | 7004 - Pinellas Virtual Franchise | School Improvement Funds | | $400.00 |
| | | | *Notes: National Honor Society funds, fees, and rewards* | | | |
| | | | | | **Total:** | **$1,200.00** |