Alachua County Public Schools

Alachua Virtual Instruction Program (District Provided)



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
ruipose and Oddine of the Sir	*
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	14
Budget to Support Goals	14

Alachua Virtual Instruction Program (District Provided)

2802 NE 8TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

https://www.sbac.edu/aes

Demographics

Principal: J ESE Ly Alvarez Masencup

Start Date for this Principal: 9/15/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active						
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5						
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education						
2019-20 Title I School	No						
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%						
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Economically Disadvantaged Students*						
School Grades History	2018-19: I (%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: D (38%)						
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) In	nformation*						
SI Region	Northeast						
Regional Executive Director	<u>Cassandra Brusca</u>						
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A						
Year							
Support Tier							
ESSA Status	N/A						

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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:

- 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	14

Last Modified: 5/4/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 4 of 14

Alachua Virtual Instruction Program (District Provided)

2802 NE 8TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

https://www.sbac.edu/aes

School Demographics

School Type and Gr (per MSID I		2019-20 Title I Schoo	I Disadvant	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)						
Elementary S PK-5	School	No	No							
Primary Servio (per MSID I		Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)						
K-12 General E	ducation	No		48%						
School Grades Histo	ory									
Year	2019-20	2018-19	2016-17	2015-16						
Grade	1	I	А	D						

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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.

The mission of the Alachua eSchool Elementary program is to develop and deliver standards-based, student-centered online courses that increase educational opportunities and 21st century skills and to provide professional development to educators that expand the scope and depth of their instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to be the district leader in online education by working collaboratively with elementary schools to offer the highest quality courses for students and teachers.

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
Stefansen, Ed	Principal	The instructional leader is responsible for setting clear goals, allocating resources to instruction, managing the curriculum, evaluating teachers, promotes growth in student learning, meets with staff members on a regular basis, work together to problem solve, set high expectations for performance, create a culture for continuous learning, modeling effective instruction, support collaboration, and give praise for effective teaching.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 9/15/2020, J ESE Ly Alvarez Masencup

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.

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.

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
-----------------------------------	--------

School Type and Grades Served	Elementary School					
(per MSID File)	PK-5					
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education					
2019-20 Title I School	No					
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%					
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Economically Disadvantaged Students*					
	2018-19: I (%)					
	2017-18: No Grade					
School Grades History	2016-17: A (66%)					
	2015-16: D (38%)					
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) In	formation*					
SI Region	Northeast					
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca					
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A					
Year						
Support Tier						
ESSA Status	N/A					
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Cod	e. 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													
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	228	211	170	151	158	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1057
Attendance below 90 percent	13	39	34	21	27	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	1	2	4	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	7	7	8	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	5	10	4	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator					(Grad	le L	.ev	el					Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	5	10	8	2	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator		Grade Level												
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	9	6	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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

Tuesday 9/15/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator						Gr	ade	e Le	vel					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	5	7	4	8	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	5	7	4	8	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator		Grade Level												Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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).

Sohool Grade Component		2019		2018				
School Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State		
ELA Achievement	0%	59%	57%	77%	59%	55%		
ELA Learning Gains	0%	57%	58%	0%	61%	57%		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	53%	0%	48%	52%		
Math Achievement	0%	60%	63%	54%	63%	61%		
Math Learning Gains	0%	61%	62%	0%	65%	61%		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	51%	0%	50%	51%		
Science Achievement	0%	57%	53%	0%	55%	51%		

	EWS Indi	cators as	Input Ea	rlier in th	e Survey		
Indicator		Grade	Level (pri	or year re	ported)		Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	(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	Comparison		School- State Comparison
03	2019	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	57%	-57%
Same Grade C	omparison	0%				
Cohort Com	Cohort Comparison					
04	2019	0%	55%	-55%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Same Grade C	omparison	0%				
Cohort Com	parison	0%				
05	2019	0%	55%	-55%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
Same Grade C	omparison	0%			•	
Cohort Com	parison	0%				

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
03	2019	0%	58%	-58%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Same Grade C	omparison	0%				
Cohort Com	Cohort Comparison					
04	2019	0%	60%	-60%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Same Grade C	omparison	0%				
Cohort Com	parison	0%				
05	2019	0%	57%	-57%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	61%	-61%
Same Grade C	Same Grade Comparison					
Cohort Com	parison	0%				

SCIENCE											
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison					
05	2019	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%					

			SCIENCE			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
Same Grade C	Same Grade Comparison					
Cohort Com	parison					

Subgroup Data

		2019	SCHO	DL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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
		2018	SCHO	DL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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
		2017	SCHO	DL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	47
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	94
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	71%

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?			
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		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	N/A 0		
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?			
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%			
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students			
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students	0		
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	0 N/A		
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0 N/A		
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students	0 N/A		
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	0 N/A 0		
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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?	0 N/A 0 N/A		
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0 N/A 0 N/A		
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? 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? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students	0 N/A 0 N/A		

Economically Disadvantaged Students		
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students		
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A	
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	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.

The eSchool Elementary program had low performance in Math. State testing showed that at least 30% of the 3rd, 4th and 5th graders received a 1 or 2. This information is from the 18 - 19 school year. We have no data from the 19-20 school year.

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

We have no recorded data other than our own observations of student performance.

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.

We have no recorded data other than our own observations of student performance.

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

We achieved great success in ELA with all students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th passing. This is data from our 18-19 school year. We provided more test prep materials for parents utilizing Canvas to house the material and treating the module as an additional course.

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

Once again, our biggest area of concern is present tested. It is easier to have our elementary students on campus for testing. We are working with homeschool and co enrollments to get the correct entries for this year.

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

- 1. Understand the process for co enrollment to have the students registered correctly before the amendment period is up after Survey 3.
- 2. Increase percent tested at the elementary level during the testing window.
- 3. Adapt to a scheduling system that was used in the 17-18 school year.
- 4. Increase parent communication and face to face instruction.
- 5. Increase training for learning coaches in navigation of Canvas courses.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our areas of focus will be our main objective in improving overall student achievement. Elementary students are not on campus frequently.

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.

Although asynchronous virtual learning can seem less personal than traditional learning modalities, Alachua eSchool works to create a culture as your local, hometown virtual school. All of our staff are located in Alachua County--in the same community where our students live--and are easily accessible. We pride ourselves on building relationships with students and their families so that students feel known, safe, and cared about. Our teachers maintain constant communication with students, including arranging face-to-face visits. Our population is diverse, and we embrace educational equity. Our teachers participate in professional development to foster culturally responsive teaching. All of our students are valued and racial and ethnic diversity are seen as assets. Our students are united by their desire to share in a flexible learning environment where the pace of instruction and time of day can adapt to meet their individual needs and schedules. We intentionally build relationships with parents and rely heavily on them as partners to monitor the learning environment and collaborate with us to support students' efforts.

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.

Total	\$0.00

Last Modified: 5/4/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 14 of 14