

Charlotte County Public Schools

# Charlotte Virtual Franchise



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

## Charlotte Virtual Franchise

1445 EDUCATION WAY, Port Charlotte, FL 33948

<http://charlottetechcollege.net/charlotte-virtual-school/>

### Demographics

**Principal: Deshon Jenkins**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/3/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	11%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (57%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

**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	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

## Charlotte Virtual Franchise

1445 EDUCATION WAY, Port Charlotte, FL 33948

<http://charlottetechcollege.net/charlotte-virtual-school/>

### 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	0%
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	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	A

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

### 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.

Charlotte Virtual School is committed to providing interactive, media-rich educational opportunities in a flexible, student-centered learning environment to a diverse population of learners.

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

To provide students a virtual curriculum in which they are engaged through a variety of instructional delivery methods, communication venues, and virtual instructional strategies which meet the academic needs of students striving towards 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
Fahey, Leanne	Other	<p>Leanne Fahey serves as the Program Manager. Working with the day to day program decisions which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitates new student enrollment and orientation</li> <li>• Monitors student pace and progress to ensure students meet graduation requirements</li> <li>• Facilitates parent conferences</li> <li>• Makes scheduling decisions in consultation with the Principal</li> <li>• Manages teachers for the exception of evaluation</li> <li>• Oversees the planning and administration of state assessments</li> <li>• Attends APC district meetings and implements policies and procedures</li> <li>• Attends all virtual school conferences</li> <li>• Youth Mental Health Commission (YMHC)</li> </ul>
Bennett, DeeLynn	Principal	Deelynn Bennett serves as the School Principal for Charlotte Virtual School. She is an instructional coach to Leanne Fahey and the virtual instructors in the continuous improvement cycle of the school.
McIntosh, Daniel	Other	Administrator of Charlotte Virtual School. Works with overseeing day to day operations with respect to Master Schedule, Teacher/Student Issues, Technology, and communication with parents/families/teachers.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 9/3/2020, Deshon Jenkins

**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.*

1

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

48

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	11%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (57%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	109	155	146	123	135	141	169	222	189	169	205	199	147	2109
Attendance below 90 percent	3	32	22	17	11	19	21	28	39	40	36	38	41	347
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	4	4	0	4	44	35	14	28	26	22	184
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	8	4	10	29	36	27	62	56	53	286
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	13	5	14	28	38	37	46	53	71	305
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	23	18	26	34	32	43	47	230
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	30	30	35	26	34	41	28	233
	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

**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	2	0	3	4	5	19	40	51	45	55	59	58	341

**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	4	9	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	5	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	1	7

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

Friday 9/11/2020

**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	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	7	8	13	16	25	82	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	2	9	

**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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	7	8	13	16	25	82	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	2	9	

**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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

## 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	71%	65%	61%	70%	70%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	49%	59%	61%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	46%	54%	0%	0%	51%
Math Achievement	65%	60%	62%	50%	50%	58%
Math Learning Gains	42%	43%	59%	51%	51%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	35%	52%	0%	0%	50%
Science Achievement	70%	60%	56%	67%	67%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	75%	78%	67%	67%	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					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	49%	-49%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	46%	-46%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	81%	53%	28%	55%	26%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		81%				
Cohort Comparison		81%				
10	2019	57%	52%	5%	53%	4%
	2018	53%	53%	0%	53%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		57%				

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%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	46%	-46%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	64%	-64%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	47%	-47%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	45%	-45%	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%	55%	-55%	48%	-48%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	67%	-67%
2018	85%	69%	16%	65%	20%
Compare		-85%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	78%	-78%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	78%	-78%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	68%	76%	-8%	70%	-2%
2018	60%	75%	-15%	68%	-8%
Compare		8%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	64%	-14%	61%	-11%
2018	64%	72%	-8%	62%	2%
Compare		-14%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	62%	0%	57%	5%
2018	41%	60%	-19%	56%	-15%
Compare		21%			

### 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	68	47		62	36			75		100	42
FRL										92	17
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	67	50		50	42		80	65		83	32
FRL										73	
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	67	56		45	50		56	67		81	52
FRL										92	55

### 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	63
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	505
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
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 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	61
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	55
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.**

Data which showed the lowest performance for the 2019 school year was Math Learning Gain at 42%.

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

Data which showed the greatest decline for the 2019 school year was Science Achievement which dropped 10% points from 80% to 70%.

Factors that may have contributed to this decline was the student load of the Science Teacher. This year we have one teacher who will be specifically teaching 8th Grade Science and another teaching Biology which should allow for more focus on these tested areas.

**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.**

Data which showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math Learning Gain with a gap of 17%.

Factors that may have contributed to this decline was the student load of the Math Teacher. This year we have one teacher who will be specifically teaching each Middle Grades Math area, another teaching Algebra, and a separate teacher teaching Geometry. This should allow for more focus on these tested areas.

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

Data which showed the most improvement for the 2019 school year was Math Achievement going from 59% to 65% (+6%).

New actions included a Study Session prior to the Alg & Geometry EOC. This will be continued this year for Middle Grades Math, Algebra, and Geometry.

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

Due to our new enrollment criteria for the 2020-2021 school year, our major areas of concern center around Level 1 students in both ELA and Math. This was not an issue in prior years due to enrollment criteria of previous years.

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

1. Level 1 ELA Students
2. Level 1 MA Students
3. ESE Student Support Services
4. 504 Student Support Services
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:****#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	ELA instruction for level 1 students is a priority for CVS to ensure students are given multiple opportunities and the supports needed to be successful in a virtual learning environment. CVS has, for the 2020-2021 school year, relaxed the criteria for enrollment and is for the first time accepting students that fall below grade level in ELA.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	CVS teachers and staff will provide tiered interventions and supports to maximize the success of all students regardless of their current ability level resulting in a minimum of 80% of students completing virtual ELA courses.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Leanne Fahey (leanne.fahey@yourcharlotteschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	CVS will use the district progress monitoring program, ClearSight and STAR, to track student progress and provide intervention or remediation as needed for ELA standards mastery.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Progress monitoring is a key component of the RtI process which has demonstrated moderate evidence, according to the What Works Clearinghouse. All students will be screened at the beginning of instruction and at a mid-way point to demonstrate academic growth. <a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/rti_reading_pg_021809.pdf#page=17">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/rti_reading_pg_021809.pdf#page=17</a>

**Action Steps to Implement**

All CVS students will participate in ClearSight and STAR BOY diagnostic testing during the district assigned progress monitoring window.

**Person Responsible** Daniel McIntosh (daniel.mcintosh@yourcharlotteschools.net)

CVS teachers will review student achievement levels and their progress toward mastery of standards to assist in providing support to student in areas of weakness.

**Person Responsible** Leanne Fahey (leanne.fahey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Math Instruction for level 1 students is a priority for CVS to ensure students are given multiple opportunities and the supports needed to be successful in a virtual learning environment. CVS has, for the 2020-2021 school year, relaxed the criteria for enrollment and is for the first time accepting students that fall below grade level in Math.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	CVS teachers and staff will provide tiered interventions and supports to maximize the success of all students regardless of their current ability level resulting in a minimum of 80% of students completing the virtual Math courses.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Daniel McIntosh (daniel.mcintosh@yourcharlotteschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	CVS Math Teachers will participate in Professional Learning Communities which focus on best practices for math teachers in a virtual environment.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Professional Learning Communities are a recognized strategy for educators teaching level 1 students sharing best practices leading to better instruction of all students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

CVS teachers will review student achievement levels and their progress toward mastery of standards to assist in providing support to student in areas of weakness.

**Person Responsible** Daniel McIntosh (daniel.mcintosh@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**CVS will undergo a year of uncharted waters and continuous reflection as we have revamped our enrollment processes as a result of the current pandemic. Teachers will be implementing PLC's in order to help better prepare their educational virtual strategies to meet the needs of our student population. Instructional staff went from 5 Full Time in 19/20 to 48 Full Time and the inclusion of Elementary School for the 20/21 school year. Teachers will rely on their colleagues for support and strategies to help reach ALL students within the confines of the FLVS curriculum.**

**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.

CVS utilizes an all virtual curriculum. Teachers are in constant contact with students via email, phone, text, and virtual meetings. Teachers will employ a variety of virtual strategies to ensure that students are engaged in the curriculum. Students with social/emotional needs will have access to request support via a link provided to students on our CVS website. Student engagement will be constantly monitored by teachers in an attempt to keep students actively engaged in the curriculum. Teachers conduct AT MINIMUM 1 Discussion Based Assessment (DBAs) per segment which requires actual communication between teacher/student. These are used for an academic check-in as well as an opportunity to build the teacher/student relationships.

**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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00