Florida Cyber Charter Academy

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Florida Cyber Charter Academy

9143 PHILLIPS HWY STE. 590, Jacksonville, FL 32256

https://www.flcca.k12.com

Demographics

Principal: Rita Whitten

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	64%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: I (%) 2016-17: D (35%) 2015-16: I (%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 9/28/2020.

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

Florida Cyber Charter Academy

9143 PHILLIPS HWY STE. 590, Jacksonville, FL 32256

https://www.flcca.k12.com

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	68%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	53%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	D	D	I	D

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 9/28/2020.

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.

Mission: What We Do and Why!

Florida Cyber Charter Academy is a high quality, virtual public charter school dedicated to helping all students reach their full potential by delivering a highly effective curriculum and implementing student-centered classroom instruction that is data driven and engaging for all learners. We empower students to be their best self and to be productive citizens who will be successful in their future endeavors as they follow their dreams. And as a K12 Powered School, we carry K12's mission to help students reach their full potential through inspired teaching and personalized learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision Statement: What We See!

Education for Any One. Students at FLCCA@Duval are part of a strong and diverse school community which celebrates their uniqueness and their brilliance.

Guiding Principles: Student achievement is our highest priority.
~ Our goal, above all, is to ensure that students are engaged to achieve by supporting a learning environment that is safe, positive and differentiated.
~ Our leaders provide direction, intention and purpose to improve student outcomes with an unwavering focus of getting better every day.
~ With the highest expectations for quality of instruction, our teachers employ best practices for teaching and learning in a virtual classroom.
~ Each member of our school community is dedicated to each student's success.
~ Should we notice a student not engaging or not achieving, we will respond with speed and intervention.
~ We are committed to hiring, retaining and supporting the growth of great leaders, great teachers and support staff.

Purpose: Aspirationally, the primary purpose of FLCCA@Duval is to atain high levels of student achievement, equipping every student with the foundations needed for any postsecondary opportunity they wish to pursue. FLCCA@Duval also recognizes its statutory obligations and Pursuant to s. 1002.33(2)(b), F.S., FLCCA@Duval shall also:

(1) Improve student learning and academic achievement;
(2) Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on low performing students and reading;
(3) Encourage the use of innovative learning methods; and
(4) Require the measurement of learning outcomes.

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
Anthony, Sandra	Principal	Dr. Sandra Anthony, Head of School/Principal, supports leadership development, board relations, school and district wide operations, systems management, budget management, oversight of all academic programs and managing relationships with K12 inc. More specifically, Dr. Anthony works with the Northeast Board of Directors acting as chief administrator the school; manages regulatory complexities and political sensitivities; implements the school's mission, vision, and strategic planning initiatives driven by K12 and the Board of Directors; develops plans and policies for the educational program; ensures policies and programs are carried out appropriately by all students, parents, and staff; communicates school budget decisions to K12 and the Board and oversees the local implementation of the budget; oversees implementation of the school marketing and enrollment plans directed by K12 to achieve and maintain enrollment capacity; serves as public relations liaison between K12 and the school community; engages community and civic groups to support school programs and the school community; effectively recruits, hires, and retains highly qualified staff; develops effective staff members through an ongoing evaluation process and professional development; creates and fosters a positive school culture by involving school staff, community leaders, students and parents; Serves as the school's instructional leader and ensures data is being used to drive all academic decisions.
White, Bridget	Other	Bridget White, Assessment and Accountability Administrator, directs all assessment for the school, including internal and state mandated tests. Additionally. Ms. White manages district relationships to ensure accountability measures are in place and enforced. Ms. White supports the development and implementation of educational policies and programs, and ensures that they are carried out appropriately by all students, parents,and staff. She also indirectly supports the academic and school improvement plan; develops and implements programs to ensure data is being used to drive academic decisions and is effectively analyzed to drive instructional practices across all grade levels and content areas.
Hill, Traci	Other	Senior Manager for Operations and Compliance
Sheffield, Samantha	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Rita Whitten

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.*
1

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	64%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: I (%) 2016-17: D (35%) 2015-16: I (%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

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	24	32	27	50	38	58	79	68	96	72	62	79	48	733
Attendance below 90 percent	2	4	3	6	5	3	8	6	14	8	3	13	3	78
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	2	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	1	0	8	1	11	14	6	1	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	17	17	22	35	24	24	20	0	0	174
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	30	36	46	36	30	43	32	0	0	275
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	11	16	17	20	25	14	21	14	1	0	139

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	1	6	1	1	5	2	11	15	18	30	7	97
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	4	2	3	5	3	7	10	10	4	1	50

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/4/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	39	49	55	71	102	56	69	74	11	3	529

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

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

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	3	2	11	0	0	3	0	19
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	39	49	55	71	102	56	69	74	11	3	529

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

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

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	3	2	11	0	0	3	0	19
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	43%	54%	61%	40%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	59%	45%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	53%	54%	44%	47%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	27%	57%	62%	20%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	36%	57%	59%	27%	52%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	52%	52%	34%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	34%	50%	56%	26%	47%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	57%	76%	78%	52%	76%	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	37%	51%	-14%	58%	-21%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	52%	-12%	58%	-18%
	2018	35%	49%	-14%	56%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	44%	50%	-6%	56%	-12%
	2018	25%	51%	-26%	55%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
06	2019	35%	47%	-12%	54%	-19%
	2018	30%	44%	-14%	52%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
07	2019	41%	44%	-3%	52%	-11%
	2018	33%	41%	-8%	51%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	51%	49%	2%	56%	-5%
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	58%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
09	2019	39%	48%	-9%	55%	-16%
	2018	39%	48%	-9%	53%	-14%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
10	2019	42%	48%	-6%	53%	-11%
	2018	29%	49%	-20%	53%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	12%	61%	-49%	62%	-50%
	2018	30%	59%	-29%	62%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	27%	64%	-37%	64%	-37%
	2018	13%	60%	-47%	62%	-49%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	22%	57%	-35%	60%	-38%
	2018	16%	61%	-45%	61%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
06	2019	15%	51%	-36%	55%	-40%
	2018	16%	42%	-26%	52%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
07	2019	40%	47%	-7%	54%	-14%
	2018	23%	50%	-27%	54%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		24%				
08	2019	20%	32%	-12%	46%	-26%
	2018	20%	31%	-11%	45%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	28%	49%	-21%	53%	-25%
	2018	20%	56%	-36%	55%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	25%	40%	-15%	48%	-23%
	2018	29%	44%	-15%	50%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		5%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	67%	-20%	67%	-20%
2018	50%	63%	-13%	65%	-15%
Compare		-3%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	69%	-22%	71%	-24%
2018	35%	84%	-49%	71%	-36%
Compare		12%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	68%	-8%	70%	-10%
2018	63%	64%	-1%	68%	-5%
Compare		-3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	57%	-27%	61%	-31%
2018	30%	61%	-31%	62%	-32%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	31%	61%	-30%	57%	-26%
2018	36%	57%	-21%	56%	-20%
Compare		-5%			

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	21	37	33	19	21	7	26	33			
BLK	40	49	32	16	29	34	17	50			

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
HSP	44	53	42	23	37	54	36	52			
MUL	42	47		21	44						
WHT	44	51	49	31	36	38	40	59	36		
FRL	37	47	35	20	38	41	32	55	55	27	

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

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	10	50		9	19		17				
BLK	39	46		14	28	33		44			
HSP	44	37		13	33		31				
MUL	47	36		31	20						
WHT	38	48	48	24	26	31	34	61	40		
FRL	37	39	38	16	24	27	22	58			

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

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	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	43
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Mathematics in all grade levels and Grade 3 in ELA showed the lowest performance. There were many contributing and interrelated factors, both internal and external, that contributed to low performance in grade 3. These include: curricula and goal attainment, applying formative assessment data with fidelity, inconsistent implementation of small group, targeted instruction and student cohort background.

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

Grade 3 ELA and Math showed the greatest decline. This decline is co-related to lowest performance and the same contributing factors apply: data application, curricula alignment, but additionally there is a need to increase rigor and depth of knowledge.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Mathematics in all levels have the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Again, curriculum alignment and instructional quality combined with a change in rigor may have contributed to the declines experienced this year.

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

There greatest same grade gains were seen in grade 5 and 10 ELA and grade 7 math for same grade and cohort comparisons. The teacher quality in these grades levels made the difference.

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

The FLCCA leadership team must and will focus its energy, efforts, resources and data practices on the areas of mathematics and ELA, schoolwide.

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

1. Increase DOK levels consistently
2. Formative assessment with NWEA
3. Targeted, small group and flex instruction
4. Provide tiered supports for sub-groups through MTSS process.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data shows mathematics at all levels is a critical need. FLCCA students are under performing compared to YoY in same grade comparison, cohort comparison, district and state.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2020-2021, students will show increased proficiency and/or growth gains to be equal to or better than district and state averages in mathematics/
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sandra Anthony (santhony@flccacademy.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will receive ongoing instructional support to implement instructional maps, differentiate for small group, targeted instruction, and formative assessment using NWEA Growth Maps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If all teachers use data to drive instruction, and work collaboratively to plan and implement highly engaging, differentiated instruction, then all learners will advance their grade level demonstrating at least a year's worth of growth.

Action Steps to Implement

1 Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction
2. Provide school-based coaching support
3. Monitor implementation of daily small group, differentiated instruction practices.
4. Adapt DOK strategies to a virtual learning environment to increase student engagement
5. Implementation of student data trackers, MOST, using NWEA Growth and USA Test Prep
6. Implementation of Reflex Math

Responsible persons: Dr. S Anthony, S Sheffield, R Whitten, B White

Person Responsible	Sandra Anthony (santhony@flccacademy.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data shows ELA at all levels is in need of improvement. FLCCA students are under performing compared to YoY in same grade comparison, cohort comparison, district and state.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2020-21 FLCCA ELA students will show increased proficiency and growth gains to a minimum of 50% in all state tested areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sandra Anthony (santhony@flccacademy.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will receive ongoing instructional support to implement instructional maps, differentiate for small group, targeted instruction, formative assessment using NWEA Growth Maps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If all teachers of English Language Arts use data to drive instruction, and work collaboratively to plan and implement highly engaging, differentiated instruction, then all learners will advance their grade level demonstrating at least a year's worth of growth.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based instruction
2. Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning
3. Monitor implementation of daily small group, differentiated instruction practices.
4. Adapt DOK strategies to a virtual learning environment to increase student engagement
5. Implementation of student data trackers, MOST, using NWEA Growth and USA Test Prep

Responsible persons: Dr. S Anthony, S Sheffield, R Whitten, B White

Person Responsible	Sandra Anthony (santhony@flccacademy.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The goal of this focus area is to increase the level of proficiency in ELA and Math overall, with an emphasis on increasing proficiency levels of our Black and African American students, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities. The staff and administration at FLCCA will monitor ESSA subgroups throughout the year through the MTSS process as there were four subgroups who fell below the 41% threshold during the 2018-2019 school year. Whenever possible, these students will be provided small group and tiered instruction to help close the achievement gap.
Measurable Outcome:	To improve academic performance of students in the following sub-groups: Students with disabilities, multi-racial, Black and economically disadvantaged.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bridget White (bwhite@k12.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utlizing the Multi-Tiered System of Support with fidelity will ensure students are identified and given the supports they need to succeed. Students are identified through assessment and observational data, and a team of stakeholders then determines their plan of action for each student. Many of these students are in need of Tier II and Tier III interventions due to significant skill gaps and proficiency deficits. Small group instruction based upon progress-monitoring data is an evidence-based strategy to improve student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale is grounded in the understanding that knowing what a student can do and how a student learns is at the heart of effective pedgaogy. Math consultant and on-staff interventionists will infom this strategy. The MTSS process is an effective system to identify and assist students with learning deficiencies. Once the students are correctly identified, Tier II small group instruction allows staff to target specific skills with progress monitoring. This provides data for dynamic grouping as students master skills. Tier III intervention allows a focused approach to substantial skill gaps for students performing two or more years below grade level. On-going progress monitoring ensures students are getting the services they need to increase proficiency levels.

Action Steps to Implement

1) On going Math consultancy, S Sheffield - Principal
2) Supplemental programs: Reflex Math, MindPlay, iXL, Reading A-Z
3) PLC on cultural diversity, S Anthony - Head of School, Lead Principal

Responsible persons: Dr. S Anthony, S Sheffield, R Whitten, B White

Person Responsible	Sandra Anthony (santhony@flccacademy.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team is committed to improving all aspects of our academic program and continuing to monitor progress toward meeting each need as identified in the needs assessment/ analysis.

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.

The FLCCA community values the role of our stakeholders in our learning community as they provide a formidable component connected to the welfare and success of our school community. At our school, we strive to develop an environment of inclusivity and belongness that encourages participation by all families and our partnerships. Together we value the benefits of a virtual education as we have built a school centered upon trust, respect and high expectations. Parents serves as learning coaches who support and extend the implementation of the curriculum by monitoring daily lessons, homework and communications through video conferences, phone calls, and our on-line platforms. Surveys and feedback are solicited in efforts to shape school policy and drive learning success. School Advisory Council meetings offer formal opportunities for parents to provide feedback and shape policy and procedures.

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: Math				$57,707.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3374	300-Purchased Services	5371 - Florida Cyber Charter Academy	General Fund		$52,757.50
			Notes: IXL, Go Formative, Dreambox, Raz, Reflex, Mindplay, Nearpod			
	1530	310-Professional and Technical Services	5371 - Florida Cyber Charter Academy	Other		$4,950.00
			Notes: Consultant			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$13,612.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2100	310-Professional and Technical Services	5371 - Florida Cyber Charter Academy	Other		$13,612.50
			Notes: IXL			

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$100,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1110	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	5371 - Florida Cyber Charter Academy	General Fund	2.0	$100,000.00
			Notes: Responsibilites divided between Head of School, Assessment and Accountability Admin, Principals and 6 Interventionists			
					Total:	$171,320.00