Florida Virtual Elementary School

leadership
analysis
students
Florida
mission
college and career
ambitious
family and community involvement
school improvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
areas of focus
instruction
resources
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
growth

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Florida Virtual Elementary School

5422 CARRIER DR., Orlando, FL 32819

www.flvsft.com

Demographics

Principal: Sico Sheri

Start Date for this Principal: 3/18/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	43%
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: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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

Florida Virtual Elementary 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)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	36%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

School Grades History

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

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.

FLVS Full Time Elementary schools mission is to help each student maximize his or her potential and meet the highest performance standards through a uniquely individualized learning program.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is for teachers, students, and parents to be empowered to create a safe, engaging, positive, and supportive student-centered environment. In this collaborative setting they are respected, motivated, and challenged through authentic learning embedded in a relevant and rigorous curriculum. Positive communication will be used to foster efficacy and interest in life-long learning.

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
Rummler, Marc	Principal	Oversee the entire operation of the school. Directly supervises assistant principals, guidance counselors and intervention team.
Sico, Sheri	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises teachers in grades 4th and 5th grades.
Fisher, Alison	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises teachers in grades Kindergarten and 1st grades.
Foster, Ryan	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises teachers in grades 2nd and 3rd grades.
Cazanas, Julian	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises teachers in Special Areas: Art, Computer Science, Physical Education, and Spanish. Supervisors the Lead Teacher Intervention program to re-engage students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 3/18/2018, Sico Sheri

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

158

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	43%
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: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	981	710	768	828	900	932	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5119
Attendance below 90 percent	108	59	57	50	41	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	366
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	1	0	0	1	4	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	2	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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

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	124	119	156	165	208	270	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1042
Attendance below 90 percent	5	1	1	1	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	1	1	3	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	56	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

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	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	124	119	156	165	208	270	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1042
Attendance below 90 percent	5	1	1	1	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	1	1	3	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	56	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

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	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	65%	65%	57%	63%	0%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	58%	54%	0%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	45%	53%	50%	0%	52%
Math Achievement	38%	38%	63%	39%	0%	61%
Math Learning Gains	32%	32%	62%	30%	0%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	26%	51%	30%	0%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	60%	53%	49%	0%	51%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey						
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(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	60%	60%	0%	58%	2%
	2018	65%	65%	0%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	67%	0%	58%	9%
	2018	65%	65%	0%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	66%	66%	0%	56%	10%
	2018	63%	63%	0%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	33%	33%	0%	62%	-29%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	52%	52%	0%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison	-19%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	40%	0%	64%	-24%
	2018	48%	48%	0%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison	-8%					
Cohort Comparison	-12%					
05	2019	41%	41%	0%	60%	-19%
	2018	49%	49%	0%	61%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison	-8%					
Cohort Comparison	-7%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	59%	0%	53%	6%
	2018	58%	58%	0%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison	1%					
Cohort Comparison						

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	38	36	31	26	37	36	31				
ELL	78	85		37	23						
BLK	56	52	50	31	31	21	36				
HSP	72	62	50	38	31	29	63				
MUL	67	50		35	25						
WHT	63	53	40	40	35	25	62				
FRL	60	57	53	32	35	25	47				
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	48	44	41	45	43	17	47				
ELL	45	38		29	33						
ASN	75	50		75	50		50				
BLK	49	44	45	36	30	28	40				
HSP	70	59	31	47	38	28	57				
MUL	66	48	38	47	27	18	69				
WHT	64	52	37	54	44	29	60				
FRL	57	51	36	40	32	21	47				

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
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	33	32	36	26	25	29	19				
ELL	20			8							
ASN	87	83		64	54		60				
BLK	51	50	61	23	22	23	31				
HSP	66	54	50	38	29	24	49				
MUL	61	63	58	39	41	36	38				
WHT	62	52	46	42	30	34	53				
FRL	55	49	48	30	27	26	42				

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	321
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	40
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	49
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	44
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	45
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	44
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.

At the end of the 2018-19 school year, FSA Math scores were low in all areas - Math Achievement, Math Learning Gains, and Math Learning Gains of Bottom 25%. School data collected throughout the year did not indicate the scores would be this low. The curriculum used during the 2018-19 school year was implemented for the first time. The school was in its first year being totally operated by FLVS and 91% of the K-5 teachers had never taught elementary students in an online environment.

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

The 2018-19 school year was the first year the elementary school was totally operated by FLVS. In comparison to Connections Academy, where FLVS students attended during the previous school year, Math Achievement level declined by an overall 12%, with 3rd grade showing this largest decline at 19%. New curriculum and the inexperience of the teachers delivering content and monitoring progress in an online environment were factors
contributing to the decline.

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.

Third grade students scored 29% below the state average in Math Achievement. As stated above, new curriculum, unreliable data, and teacher experience all contributed to this significant gap between school and state FSA scores.

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

Fifth grade students, at the end of the 2018-19 school year, showed 3% increase in ELA Achievement. Since it was the first year for the school, new curriculum, teachers and schedules were all newly implemented from the prior year.

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

The number of students scoring on Level 1 on FSA is a concern. School personnel must identify these students early, provide appropriate support, and monitor progress frequently.

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

1. Math achievement in all school grade calculated areas
2. ELA learning gains of lowest 25%
3. Students with Disabilities in all school grade calculated areas
4. African-American students in all school grade calculated areas

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2019, 3rd grade students scored 29% below the state average, 4th grade students scored 24% below the state average, and 5th grade students scored 19% below the state average in Math. (Cognia Standards: 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.9, 1.10, 2.2, 2.5, 2.6, 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 3.1, 3.2, 3,3, 3.5 & 3.6)
Measurable Outcome:	Student achievement, as measured by the 2021 Math FSA, will show an overall increase of 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. The refinement and implementation of the curriculum to ensure comprehension of grade-level math standards. (Cognia Standards: 1.3, 1.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.10, 2.11 & 2.12) 2. The implementation of additional resources to ensure mastery of math standards. (Cognia Standards: 2.9, 3.5 & 3.6) 3. The development of a highly trained staff. (Cognia Standards: 1.1, 1.6, 1.9, 1.10, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2 & 3.3)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategy 1: A gap was identified in the exposure to FSA tested standard rigor. Student performance on FSA Math did not match that of performance on course module exams. Strategy 2: Students, working in an environment where direct instruction time is limited, require relevant and engaging resources in order to master essential skills. Strategy 3: Students must be provided with highly trained teachers in the area of mathematics to ensure the delivery of instruction and the content being taught rises to the level students need in order to be successful.

Action Steps to Implement

Strategy 1:
1. Meet with Curriculum Department Senior Manager bi-weekly to identify potential areas of enhancement to the curriculum.
2. Appoint a focus group of teachers to work with Curriculum Department Manager to assist in the development of curriculum enhancements.
3. Develop math teams on every grade level to meet weekly to analyze curriculum and assessments and to develop live lesson content.
4. Develop and utilize a central location to collect and monitor student data.
5. Conduct touchpoint weeks throughout the school year for teachers to assess students 1:1.
6. Conduct 1:1 monthly Classroom Walkthrough meetings between teachers and assistant principals to analyze student data.
7. Increase the weekly minutes of Tier 3 sessions for students.

Person Responsible	Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)

Strategy 2:
1. Utilize additional personnel to decrease the size of the Tier 2 groups of students.
2. Provide tutoring to academically at-risk students.
3. Assign specific math iReady lessons to students based on their needs.

4. Develop math lessons in Nearpod to enhance engagement and data collection.
5. Implement practice FSA tests to the students.

Person Responsible   Sheri Sico (ssico@flvs.net)

Strategy 3:
1. Provide professional development for teachers in math instruction during staff meetings.
2. Provide opportunity for teachers, as selected by administrators, to share best practices in math instruction during staff meetings.
3. Create Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with the focus on student engagement.
4. Train teachers in the development of Tier 2 lessons.
5. Provide opportunity for the grade level math teachers to attend the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Conference.
6. Conduct weekly meetings Director and Principal, and Principal with Assistant Principals to analyze teacher data.

Person Responsible   Ryan Foster (rfoster@flvs.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2019, 45% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains which is 8% below the state average. (Cognia Standards: 1.1, 1.3, 1.10, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.9, 2.11, 2.12, 3.1, 3.2, 3.5 & 3.6)
Measurable Outcome:	Students in the lowest 25%, as measured by the 2021 ELA FSA, will show an increase of 3% in learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. The implementation of differentiated instruction and scaffolded curriculum to identified students. (Cognia Standards: 1.1, 1.10, 2.2, 2.5, 2.6, 2.9, 2.11, 2.12, 3.1 & 3.2) 2. The implementation of additional resources to ensure mastery of reading standards. (Cognia Standards: 1.3, 2.4, 3.5, 3.6)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategy 1: Based on the gap between the learning gains of all students and those in the lowest 25%, there is a need to ensure these at-risk students are receiving beneficial curriculum and instruction. Strategy 2: Students, working in an environment where direct instruction time is limited, require relevant and engaging resources in order to master essential skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Strategy 1:
1. Identify the lowest 30% of students to be closely monitored.
2. Develop and utilize a central location to collect and monitor student data.
3. Schedule weekly data chats with teachers to ensure students are being provided necessary instruction.
4. Include the lowest 30% of students in the 1:1 monthly Classroom Walkthrough meetings between teachers and assistant principals.
5. Develop reading teams on every grade level to meet weekly to analyze curriculum and assessments and to develop live lesson content.
6. Provide opportunity for teachers, as selected by administrators, to share best practices in reading instruction during staff meetings.
7. Train teachers in the development of Tier 2 lessons.
8. Create Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with the focus on student engagement.
9. Increase the weekly minutes of Tier 3 sessions for students.

Person Responsible	Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)

Strategy 2:
1. Utilize additional personnel to decrease the size of the Tier 2 groups of students.
2. Provide tutoring to academically at-risk students.
3. Assign specific reading iReady lessons to students based on their needs.
4. Develop reading lessons in Nearpod to enhance engagement and data collection.
5. Implement practice FSA tests to the students.
6. Develop an online library for students to access books 24 hours/day 7 days/week.
7. Provide additional resources online for parents to utilize with their children.
8. Provide Family Literacy Nights to educate and provide resources for parents to assist their children.

Person Responsible	Sheri Sico (ssico@flvs.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2019, Students with Disabilities (SWD) were below the Federal Percent of Points Index by 7%. (Cognia Standards: 1.3, 1.6, 1.10, 2.9, 2.11, 2.12 & 3.8)
Measurable Outcome:	Students with Disabilities (SWD) will meet or exceed the Federal Percent of Points Index of 41% as measured by the 2021 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. The implementation of an instructional model to effectively deliver instruction and monitor progress. (Cognia Standards: 1.3, 1.6, 1.10, 2.9, 2.11, 2.12 & 3.8)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategy 1: Based on this group of students not meeting the Federal Percent of Points Index minimum score, there is a need to ensure these at-risk students are receiving beneficial curriculum and instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Strategy 1:
1. Notify all teachers of their students classified as SWD.
2. Add a field in the central data collection system to identify these students to better monitor.
3. Monitor progress during the 1:1 monthly Classroom Walkthrough meetings between teachers and assistant principals.
4. Provide additional support to these students via Tier 2, Tier 3, and tutoring sessions.
5. Train teachers in the development of Tier 2 lessons.
6. Increase the weekly minutes of Tier 3 sessions for students.
7. Hire additional ESE personnel to meet the needs of these students.
8. Differentiate the roles of the ESE teachers to ensure students are provided needed support.
9. Conduct weekly SST (Student Support Team) meetings to monitor progress of students.
10. Offer test-taking strategies sessions for students.

Person Responsible	Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2019, African-American students were below the Federal Percent of Points Index by 1%. (Cognia Standards: 1.3, 1.6, 1.10, 2.9, 2.11, 2.12 & 3.5)
Measurable Outcome:	African-American students will meet or exceed the Federal Percent of Points Index of 41% as measured by the 2021 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The implementation of effective instruction and resources to identified students. (Cognia Standards: 1.3, 1.6, 1.10, 2.9, 2.11, 2.12 & 3.5)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategy 1: Based on this group of students not meeting the Federal Percent of Points Index minimum score, there is a need to ensure these students are receiving beneficial curriculum and instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Strategy 1:
1. Notify all teachers of their students classified as African-American.
2. Add a field in the central data collection system to identify these students to better monitor.
3. Monitor progress during the 1:1 monthly Classroom Walkthrough meetings between teachers and assistant principals.
4. Provide additional support to these students via Tier 2, Tier 3, and tutoring sessions, as needed.
5. Assign specific iReady reading and math lessons as needed.
6. Offer test-taking strategies sessions for students.

Person Responsible	Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The concern noted in 2e was the high number of students scoring a Level 1 on FSA. All four focus areas above (III.A.) list strategies aligned to the Cognia standards to address the needs of students achieving below grade level.

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.

Parent and family engagement is a centerpiece of the FLVS FT Elementary School model and is integral to improving student academic achievement. Parent and family engagement is also underscored in the Learning Coach Agreement which every parent must sign when enrolling their child. Each FLVS FT student has a Learning Coach, a parent or other responsible adult designated by the parents, who works with him or her in person, under
the guidance of a Florida-certified professional teacher. Whether a parent's role is a Learning Coach, or as someone providing oversight to the Learning Coach, all parents and guardians are intimately familiar with their child's progress on a day-to-day basis. The Learning Coaches are directly involved with students' day-to-day learning.

FLVS FT Elementary believes in involving parents in all aspects of its Title I programs. These programs will be planned and operated with meaningful consultation with parents of participating children, including the school-parent compact. The SAC has the responsibility of evaluating the various district and school level plans, including the SIP and the PFEPs. More than 50% of the members of the SAC are parent (non-employee) representatives. All parents are given the opportunity to review the plan and offer their input prior to approval. The PFEP was sent to all parents via webmail (with a read receipt, read required specification) and is placed on the Family Resource Center.

Parents were also provided with the Parent Satisfaction Survey at the end of the school year requesting their input regarding curriculum, parent involvement activities, school communication, and student achievement. As a result of the information shared from parents, the school has adopted the Leader-In-Me Program. This program establishes a "whole-child" mindset with the belief that all students can be leaders.

Cognia Standards 1.8, 2.3, 2.4, 3.6 & 3.7

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	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00

4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00