

Florida Virtual School

Florida Virtual High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Florida Virtual High School

5422 CARRIER DR., Orlando, FL 32819

www.flvsft.com

Demographics

Principal: Daniele Shick

Start Date for this Principal: 5/24/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	32%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 FL Virtual County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Florida Virtual High School

5422 CARRIER DR., Orlando, FL 32819

www.flvsft.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)
High School 9-12	No	37%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the FL Virtual County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mission: To deliver a high quality, technology-based education that provides the skills and knowledge students need for success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: To transform education worldwide – one student at a time.

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
Shick, Daniele	Principal	<p>The Principal provides instructional leadership for the planning, management, operation and evaluation of the FLVS FT School. The Principal manages Instructional Leaders, ensuring that they work with teachers to ensure that each child successfully completes his/her instruction program. The Principal manages the overall school operation working with parents, students, support staff and certified teachers who “virtually” facilitate a student instructional program.</p>
Anderson, Curry	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the Principal, assists in managing the FLVS FT School and its human resources to attain school goals by providing evidence of effective instruction that results in student achievement, as recognized through defined learning gains and survey results. The Assistant Principal supports the instructional process with specific responsibility for managing assigned programs/services; providing information /serving as a resource to others; and supervising assigned staff. The Assistant Principal will also oversee personal and professional growth activities of assigned staff.</p>
Deas, Dari	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the Principal, assists in managing the FLVS FT School and its human resources to attain school goals by providing evidence of effective instruction that results in student achievement, as recognized through defined learning gains and survey results. The Assistant Principal supports the instructional process with specific responsibility for managing assigned programs/services; providing information /serving as a resource to others; and supervising assigned staff. The Assistant Principal will also oversee personal and professional growth activities of assigned staff.</p>
Elenzweig, Nicole	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the Principal, assists in managing the FLVS FT School and its human resources to attain school goals by providing evidence of effective instruction that results in student achievement, as recognized through defined learning gains and survey results. The Assistant Principal supports the instructional process with specific responsibility for managing assigned programs/services; providing information /serving as a resource to others; and supervising assigned</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		staff. The Assistant Principal will also oversee personal and professional growth activities of assigned staff.
Mercer, Ronald	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the Principal, assists in managing the FLVS FT School and its human resources to attain school goals by providing evidence of effective instruction that results in student achievement, as recognized through defined learning gains and survey results. The Assistant Principal supports the instructional process with specific responsibility for managing assigned programs/services; providing information /serving as a resource to others; and supervising assigned staff. The Assistant Principal will also oversee personal and professional growth activities of assigned staff.
VanHook, Natalie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the Principal, assists in managing the FLVS FT School and its human resources to attain school goals by providing evidence of effective instruction that results in student achievement, as recognized through defined learning gains and survey results. The Assistant Principal supports the instructional process with specific responsibility for managing assigned programs/services; providing information /serving as a resource to others; and supervising assigned staff. The Assistant Principal will also oversee personal and professional growth activities of assigned staff.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 5/24/2020, Daniele Shick

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

174

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	32%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	35	42	43	134
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	36	36	21	112
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	42	60	44	209
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	37	32	24	140

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	30	32	25	27	114

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	27	64	52	16	159	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	30	9	66	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/8/2020

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	571	688	707	812	2778	
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	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	
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	0	0	0	571	688	707	812	2778
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	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	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%	71%	56%	71%	0%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	59%	51%	61%	0%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	39%	42%	48%	0%	41%
Math Achievement	53%	53%	51%	60%	0%	49%
Math Learning Gains	48%	48%	48%	54%	0%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27%	27%	45%	42%	0%	39%
Science Achievement	81%	81%	68%	66%	0%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	84%	84%	73%	78%	0%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	74%	74%	0%	55%	19%
	2018	78%	78%	0%	53%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	70%	70%	0%	53%	17%
	2018	72%	72%	0%	53%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	80%	83%	-3%	67%	13%
2018	84%	84%	0%	65%	19%
Compare		-4%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	81%	81%	0%	71%	10%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	83%	0%	70%	13%
2018	85%	85%	0%	68%	17%
Compare		-2%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	64%	-17%	61%	-14%
2018	70%	70%	0%	62%	8%
Compare		-23%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	56%	59%	-3%	57%	-1%
2018	69%	69%	0%	56%	13%
Compare		-13%			

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	31	43	28	32	39	27	54	48		88	14
ASN	79	64		68	35		88	80		85	35
BLK	72	57	30	37	37	32	65	83		80	36
HSP	66	58	37	47	38	15	79	77		82	30
MUL	80	64		61	71		86	89		86	42
WHT	72	60	40	56	52	34	83	86		81	30
FRL	68	56	33	48	42	22	82	79		79	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
SWD	36	48	43	33	46	45	27	47		79	15
ASN	89	70		88	62		94	83	100	70	19
BLK	67	63	54	48	53	50	62	72	61	66	20
HSP	73	61	52	58	53	51	64	80	54	68	28
MUL	82	59	48	66	47	44	69	86	55	67	25
WHT	75	59	54	64	53	46	77	87	64	67	27
FRL	68	60	52	54	52	45	67	76	51	64	28
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	40	51	38	26	35	31	36	47	8	85	4

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
ELL	46	57		58	45						
ASN	74	64		69	61		79	75	82	69	
BLK	62	61	51	44	49	31	60	73	39	65	15
HSP	69	64	49	55	51	38	59	75	34	66	25
MUL	71	61	57	63	60	45	69	81	33	58	24
WHT	73	60	47	62	56	45	69	80	36	67	25
FRL	64	58	49	53	55	43	58	73	29	62	15

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	574
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	67
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	59
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	54
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.

Two areas of low performance identified are the ELA Low Quartile Gains 39% (down from 53% in 2018) state is at 42% and Math Low Quartile Gains 27% (down from 48% in 2018) state is at 45%. As our school population has grown, we have seen an increase in below proficiency enrollments year over year. The intervention team was understaffed and there was a lack of a school-wide MTSS approach.

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

The greatest decline was present in the same areas: ELA Low Quartile Gains and Math Low Quartile Gains. As our school population has grown, we have seen an increase in below proficiency enrollments year over year. The intervention team was understaffed and there was a lack of a school-wide MTSS approach.

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.

Math Low Quartile was the greatest gap observed with 18% difference between school and state scores. Restructuring the course sequence may have effected our math scores as well as a pilot of block scheduling for some students.

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

The greatest area of improvement was in Science where we grew from 73% to 81%, therefore an 8% growth from year over year. An emphasis on Biology achievement occurred and individual and small groups of teachers worked to strengthen student resources.

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

This is not applicable to the high school

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

1. Math Low Quartile Gains (with a focus on the SWD and HSP subgroup)
2. ELA Low Quartile Gains (with a focus on the SWD and BLK subgroup)
3. 10th grade ELA Achievement
4. Algebra and Geometry EOC Achievement increase

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The team observed a need in our areas of low quartile math and ELA learning gains; one area to focus on for improvement is the structure of our MTSS framework and implementing more data-driven, small group learning opportunities. This will impact student learning as more highly qualified staff will be available to provide targeted remediation as needed. Cognia Standards: 1.3, 2.7, 2.10, 3.6, 3.7
---	---

Measurable Outcome: Based on our student progress monitoring report, we expect to see 80% of our targeted instruction groups on or near pace throughout the year. This will demonstrate engagement and successful completion of grade-level coursework.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ronald Mercer (rmercerc@flvs.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The MTSS team will work closely with students, provide professional development to staff for this area of focus, and use data to inform practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence-based strategies for students for effective instruction will be utilized. The MTSS model is a proven and research-based structure for improving student outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development to staff on the Multi-Tiered System of Supports and varying levels of intervention and support

Person Responsible Deanna DeFilippo (ddefilippo@flvs.net)

Train staff how to utilize the Student Progress Report to monitor student progress and provide intervention strategies.

Person Responsible Ronald Mercer (rmercerc@flvs.net)

Provide professional development to intervention staff on progress monitoring tools such as iReady and Scantron.

Person Responsible Deanna DeFilippo (ddefilippo@flvs.net)

Provide support and oversight of intervention and content teacher collaboration, instruction, and student supports.

Person Responsible Natalie VanHook (nvanhook@flvs.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

After reviewing 2018-19 school year state assessment data as compared to prior year data, our team discovered a decrease across the board in learning gains. Our top concern is the area of learning gains of the lowest 25% across all subgroups. Students with Disabilities decreased 15% in ELA L25 and 18% in Math L25 as well as being below the ESSA Federal Index of 41%. Black students decreased 24% in ELA L25 and 18% in Math L25. Hispanic students showed a decrease of 15% in ELA L25 and 36% in Math L25. White students showed a decrease in ELA L25 by 14% and a decrease of 12% in Math L25. Free and Reduced Lunch students showed a decrease of 19% in ELA L25 and a 23% decrease in Math L25.

Given this trend, one area of focus will be improving learning gains across all subgroups with an emphasis on Students with Disabilities, Hispanic students in the area of Math, and Black students in the area of ELA.

Cognia Standards: 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, 2.9, 2.10, 2.11

Measurable Outcome:

By July 2015, FLVS Full Time High School will increase learning gains of the lowest 25% in all subgroups by at least 2%. Our Students with Disabilities subgroup will meet or exceed state averages.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniele Shick (dshick@flvs.net)

We are utilizing a multi-tiered system of supports to address skill gap areas, scaffold instruction, and promote learning gains.

Students are screened using iReady (9th) or Scantron (10-12th) assessments. These students are offered small group interventions (MTSS Tier 3) to support them in skill gap areas, delivered by highly qualified instructors.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Regarding our ELA goal, intervention includes research-based literacy strategies for: comprehension, vocabulary, decoding, and fluency. Examples include: reciprocal teaching, repeated readings, multi-sensory learning and close reading strategies, and metacognitive strategies. Additionally, instructors are familiar with and utilize Signposts Strategies and fluency sessions utilize the Orton-Gillingham approach.

Regarding our Math goal, our intervention provides differentiated instruction. Small groups use the gradual release model and scaffold instruction. Math literacy is promoted. Instructors also use anticipation guides, guided notes, guided discovery, problem-based learning, as well as testing taking strategies. Students have access to Shmoop, which is a program aligned with Florida's standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In the category of Students with Disabilities in our Low Quartile, the data shows a drop of 15% in ELA, and a drop of 18% in Math scores. In the subcategory of Black students in our Low Quartile, the data show a drop of 24% in ELA, and 18% in math achievement. Additionally, in the subcategory of Hispanic students in our Low Quartile, the data show a drop of 15% in ELA and 36% in math achievement. We have compared our overall data with the state data available at FLDOE's EduData Portal to help formulate these goals. Utilizing the strategies listed above is based on information collected from the What Works Clearinghouse and Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Supports approach to meeting the

needs of all students. (Selected assessments such as iReady demonstrate strong evidence as a reading program, and Scantron assessments are aligned with Florida's ELA standards.)

Action Steps to Implement

Provide regular professional development to staff regarding state assessment and progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible Daniele Shick (dshick@flvs.net)

Provide professional development to staff on the Multi-Tiered System of Supports and varying levels of intervention and support

Person Responsible Deanna DeFilippo (ddefilippo@flvs.net)

Train staff how to utilize the Student Progress Report to monitor student progress and provide intervention strategies.

Person Responsible Ronald Mercer (rmercerc@flvs.net)

Provide professional development to intervention staff on progress monitoring tools such as iReady and Scantron.

Person Responsible Deanna DeFilippo (ddefilippo@flvs.net)

Provide support and oversight of intervention and content teacher collaboration, instruction, and student supports.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Provide professional development opportunities to support staff in teaching strategies, differentiation, and instructional support.

Person Responsible Daniele Shick (dshick@flvs.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Regular review of data via monthly data chats and emphasis on student progress monitoring; including additional licenses for screening purposes.

Restructuring of MTSS Tier Support across the school.

Professional development in interventions and literacy strategies shared school-wide, support, and coaching ongoing throughout the school year.

The addition of Math and Reading Intervention Instructors for Tier 2 and 3 needs.

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.

Building a positive school culture will be an emphasis for the coming school year. Staff will begin the year by reading "Lead with Culture" and will continue to develop professionally in this area. Key staff will be devoted to engaging families through virtual and community meetups (if possible). All homeroom teachers will work to develop strong relationships with their students and families throughout the year to serve as liaison and an additional academic coach.

Cognia Standards: 2.2, 2.3, 2.4

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: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00