Lake County Schools

Lake Virtual Franchise

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Virtual Franchise

200 W GOLF LINKS AVE, Eustis, FL 32726

https://lcvs.lake.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Donald (Paul) Miller

Start Date for this Principal: 9/1/2017

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)	30%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Lake 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

Lake Virtual Franchise

200 W GOLF LINKS AVE, Eustis, FL 32726

https://lcvs.lake.k12.fl.us/

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	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	55%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake 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: The mission of Lake County Virtual School is to provide a personalized, mastery-based education in a safe, supportive online environment that promotes self discipline, motivation, and excellence in learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: The vision of Lake County Virtual School is to develop, support, and expand a highly-rated virtual education program that meets the 21st century learning needs of ALL Lake County students.

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
Miller, Paul	Principal	
Mendez, Carolyn	Teacher, K-12	
Stratton, Bridget	Teacher, K-12	
Carrasquillo, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	
Clark, Stacie	School Counselor	
Berry, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	
Taylor, Natalie	Teacher, K-12	
De La Cruz, Julia	Teacher, K-12	
Fiorentino, Anthony	Teacher, K-12	
Husemann, Joshua	Teacher, K-12	
King, Derrick	Administrative Support	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 9/1/2017, Donald (Paul) Miller

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
138

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)	30%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	214	233	232	210	235	257	265	332	311	328	337	377	251	3582
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	0	1	0	5	6	6	3	1	2	2	1	30
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	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	26	35	45	40	67	49	82	43	398
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	37	40	59	59	53	53	93	46	448

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	2	5	11	15	23	31	41	40	38	42	66	55	32	401

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	2	2	3	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	9	3	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	0	7	2	7	4	28

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 10/22/2020

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	5	5	3	6	1	8	5	6	15	5	6	17	82
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	1	0	1	7

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	

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	5	5	3	6	1	7	3	7	13	5	7	35	97
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
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	1	1	1	2	1	1	7	14

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	1	1	1	1	10	14

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	56%	68%	61%	79%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	63%	59%	71%	65%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	54%	0%	50%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	59%	70%	62%	79%	69%	58%
Math Learning Gains	54%	65%	59%	58%	67%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	52%	0%	65%	50%
Science Achievement	50%	59%	56%	81%	64%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	83%	78%	85%	82%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
	2018	60%	47%	13%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-60%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	64%	49%	15%	52%	12%
	2018	58%	48%	10%	51%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		43%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
09	2019	0%	47%	-47%	55%	-55%
	2018	91%	46%	45%	53%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		-91%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	86%	49%	37%	53%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-86%				
Cohort Comparison		-91%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	53%	-53%	55%	-55%
	2018	60%	49%	11%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-60%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	70%	58%	12%	54%	16%
	2018	83%	59%	24%	54%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	50%	39%	11%	46%	4%
	2018	0%	39%	-39%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		50%				
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	9%	49%	-40%	48%	-39%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	66%	1%	67%	0%
2018	75%	61%	14%	65%	10%
Compare		-8%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	71%	-7%	71%	-7%
2018	67%	70%	-3%	71%	-4%
Compare		-3%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	67%	0%	70%	-3%
2018	94%	69%	25%	68%	26%
Compare		-27%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	52%	-52%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	49%	-49%	57%	-57%
2018	70%	50%	20%	56%	14%
Compare		-70%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
WHT	58	58		52	50		55	64		100	16

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
WHT	78	35		73	50		82	80		91	38
FRL	69	50		64	40						

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
WHT	78	73		78	56		79	82		65	25
FRL										59	20

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
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	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

As LCVS now serves such a large cross section of students, I will answer based on District Performance in 2019: the lowest scored component was ELA Lowest 25% (33%). One contributing factor from 2019 could be lack of identifying students for remediation through diagnostic tools (LSA, etc.). We also plan to increase the consistent use of reading strategies during instruction and the teaching of other student owned strategies to students.

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

As LCVS now serves such a large cross section of students, I will answer based on District Performance in 2019: the greatest declined component was ELA Lowest 25% (-11). One contributing factor from 2019 could be lack of identifying students for remediation through diagnostic tools (LSA, etc.). We also plan to increase the consistent use of reading strategies during instruction and the teaching of other student owned strategies to students.

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.

As LCVS now serves such a large cross section of students, I will answer based on District Performance in 2019:
the greatest gap in components was both ELA Lowest 25% (-9) and Math Lowest 25% (-9). One contributing factor from 2019 could be lack of identifying students for remediation through diagnostic tools (LSA, etc.). This year we will work toward strengthening our Multi-Tiered System of Supports and targeted interventions.

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

As LCVS now serves such a large cross section of students, I will answer based on District Performance in 2019:
the most improved component was Science Achievement (+3). LCVS was specifically implementing Face-To-Face Science Tutoring Sessions on a weekly basis in the second half of the year for Biology.

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

Two areas of concern would be Level 1 ELA students (11% of overall enrollments) and Level 1 Math students (8.5% of overall enrollments). An additional area would be the number of students enrolled this year. Historically we have only served a small percentage of students and due to COVID we have had a huge increase in enrollment. Ensuring we build systems to support a larger population will be critical.

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

1. Improve achievement of Lowest 25% in ELA
2. Improve achievement of Lowest 25% in Math
3. Improve achievement of Level 1 ELA Students
4. Improve achievement of Level 1 Math Students
5. Improve achievement of ESE and ELL Students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Academic Area of Focus: LCVS will Improve Student Achievement in ELA and Math through implementing standards-focused live lessons (ZOOM) that have a clear purpose and incorporate high impact, collaborative learning strategies. This process will allow LCVS instructors the opportunity to utilize student data (iReady, LSA, etc.) to determine the standards-based focus of live lessons and, there by, address specific student learning gaps. This is a critical need area as District achievement in ELA and Math (2019) was 50% and 44% respectively.
Measurable Outcome:	Students achievement scores in ELA and Math will increase by 5% at all grade levels.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Paul Miller (millerp@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will implement standards-focused live lessons (ZOOM) that establish a clear purpose for learning and incorporate collaborative learning strategies (break-out rooms for collaboration, virtual Kagan-strategy based processes, etc.) to support all student learning and achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students need to understand the purpose of learning specific content ("the why") and then be provided varying collaborative learning opportunities that support, extend, and solidify student understanding. LCVS must improve instruction, level of student engagement, and overall student performance by focusing on clear, purposeful (relevant) live lessons that incorporate collaborative learning experiences for the students. As a Faculty and Staff, we must believe in this process and support its incorporation in all curriculum areas. LCVS instructors consistently provide guided instruction to students and and independent learning opportunities are interwoven into the online curriculum. However, there is room for improvement regarding instructional focus and collaborative learning. As Fisher and Frey (2014) stated, "we believe that all four phases of the gradual release of responsibility framework - focused instruction, guided instruction, collaborative learning, and independent learning - are necessary if we want student to learn deeply, think critically and creatively, and be able to mobilize learning strategies" (p.14).

Action Steps to Implement

Middle/High School:
1. Provide Data to teachers (Performance Matters, LSA, FSA/EOC, DBA and Exam Scores).
2. Discuss importance of implementing 2 weekly live lessons (ZOOM) to address student learning deficiencies during Leadership Team meetings, faculty meetings, and department/grade chair meetings. Review and discuss strategies (developing "the why," break-out rooms for collaboration, virtual Kagan-strategy based processes, etc.) that have a high impact on student achievement.
3. Have teachers implement standards-focused live lessons (ZOOM); observe and support teachers; provide feedback on best practices.
4. Repeat process after each interim cycle; incorporate MTSS team, ELL team, and/or ELL team as needed.

Person Responsible	Paul Miller (millerp@lake.k12.fl.us)

Elementary School:
1. Provide Data to teachers (Performance Matters, iReady, FSA, DBA and Exam Scores).
2. Discuss importance of implementing 3 weekly live lessons (ZOOM) to address student learning

deficiencies during Leadership Team meetings, faculty meetings, and department/grade chair meetings. Review and discuss strategies (developing "the why," break-out rooms for collaboration, virtual Kagan-strategy based processes, etc.) that have a high impact on student achievement.
3. Have teachers implement standards-focused live lessons (ZOOM); observe and support teachers; provide feedback on best practices.
4. Repeat process after each interim cycle; incorporate MTSS team, ELL team, and/or ELL team as needed.

Person Responsible	Paul Miller (millerp@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	School Culture Area of Focus: LCVS will improve its overall school culture by increasing its capacity to provide students with expanded opportunities for Social Emotional Learning through Edgenuity's Purpose Prep Program. Incorporating this Program will support virtual learners mental health which, in turn, will support and improve academic learning within our school community. Based on the data for this year, LCVS has over 400 students with 2 or more EWS indicators. These students need to be supported both academically and emotionally to achieve success, especially as many are first time virtual learners.
Measurable Outcome:	All LCVS students will participate in SEL Purpose Prep Program this year to meet both FLDOE expectations as well as specific SEL needs of virtual students. 100% of students will participate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Derrick King (kingd1@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Edgenuity's Purpose Prep Program is built for virtual implementation and will allow students to work both collaboratively (with MHL, Teachers, Counselors, and other students) and independently in developing strong mental health.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SEL is an integral part of building a foundation for student success. Students need to have the opportunity to learn about their SEL health and implement strategies to support themselves and others.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Plan process with LCVS Leadership Team (Admin, Counselors, and MHL)
2. Get Purpose Prep access for all LCVS students (Admin, MHL, IT/Skyward/Classlink)
3. Implement SEL plan and support student learning both collaboratively and independently

Person Responsible	Derrick King (kingd1@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Other specifically relating to Lowest Quartile Achievement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Intervention Area of Focus: LCVS will support Lower Quartile Students in both ELA and Math with Extended Learning Opportunities (required small group live lessons (ZOOM)) and content-specific, remediation-focused tutoring sessions (ZOOM or in-person when allowed)). The Lowest Quartile category was the lowest scored element in both ELA and Math.
Measurable Outcome:	Lower Quartile students will increase achievement 5% in ELA and Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Paul Miller (millerp@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Remediation and extended learning (small group) opportunities will provide more contact time between the students and standards with the support of certified teachers and other support personnel.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing standards-based remediation opportunities for Lower Quartile Students will both increase performance in current virtual courses as well as achievement on state-based exams.

Action Steps to Implement

Middle/High School:
1. Develop Remediation and Extended Learning plan and focus areas with LCVS Leadership Team (including MTSS Team - Ms. Cervantes) and Middle/High School Department Heads. Plan and focus areas will address learning needs based on analysis of Lowest Quartile Performance on LSA and FSA/EOC/State Data.
2. Review SAI Funds for determining scope plan(hours available, teachers available, etc.).
3. Implement plan to support learning amongst Lowest Quartile students (Extended Learning Opportunities and/or tutoring sessions).
4. Review Effectiveness at end of Grading Period 2, Grading Period 3.

Person Responsible	Paul Miller (millerp@lake.k12.fl.us)

Elementary School:
1. Develop Remediation and Extended Learning plan and focus areas with LCVS Leadership Team (including MTSS Team - Ms. Gault and Ms. Paradis) and Elementary Grade Chairs. Plan and focus areas will address learning needs based on analysis of Lowest Quartile Performance on iReady and FSA/EOC/State Data.
2. Review SAI Funds for determining scope (hours available, teachers available, etc.) of plan.
3. Implement plan to support learning amongst Lowest Quartile students (Extended Learning Opportunities and/or tutoring sessions).
4. Review Effectiveness at end of Grading Period 2, Grading Period 3.

Person Responsible	Paul Miller (millerp@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The LCVS Leadership Team will continue to develop, train, and expand both the ESE and ESOL Teams to meet the needs of students. These teams will develop and implement live lesson (ZOOM) support sessions as well as "push-in" support of general education virtual instructors.

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.

Lake County Virtual School maintains a website that contains the mission and vision of Lake County Virtual School. This website is updated quite often to keep students, parents, and community member up to date on school information and events. LCVS' Administrators and Staff attend community events where information regarding online virtual school is requested. Other personnel also attend events where they are asked to speak regarding Lake County Virtual School. LCVS does have an active School Advisory Council with school-based, student, parent, and community member representation..

All students and parents/guardians receive a welcome call from each of the student's teachers informing them of the course, the requirements, and a discussion regarding any special needs of the student that need to be addressed. Teachers regularly communicate with students on an individual basis as they do DBA's, monthly calls, and work with students on assignments. Teachers listen to student concerns, problems, ideas, and form bonds with students.

The guidance counselor works with individual students and parents regarding their successes, behind pace issues, and informs them of graduation and college and technical school requirements and opportunities. Face-to face meetings often occur with students to discuss their futures. Lake County Virtual also offers field trips and club opportunities to increase student and parent/guardian involvement.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Lowest Quartile Achievement				$12,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	7004 - Lake Virtual Franchise	Other		$12,000.00
			Notes: SAI Funding to support after-hours tutoring for level 1 and 2 students.			
					Total:	$12,000.00