

Clay County Schools

# Clay Virtual Franchise



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

## Clay Virtual Franchise

2306 KINGSLEY AVE #20, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://cva.oneclay.net>

### Demographics

**Principal: Amanda Stilianou**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School 4-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	21%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: I (%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: I (%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

## Clay Virtual Franchise

2306 KINGSLEY AVE #20, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://cva.oneclay.net>

### 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 4-12	No	29%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

Our mission is to offer a virtual education experience which allows students to dream, achieve, and soar anywhere, anytime on any path.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Clay Virtual Academy will provide students a learning path in an innovative online environment where mastery learning is the focus of each child's motivation, organization, and dedication in preparing them to be leaders in a global marketplace.

### 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
Weaver, Gayle	Other	Running data reports and using them to drive professional development opportunities for teachers and staff.
Kowieski, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Directly responsible to the school principal and serves in staff relationships. Assume all administrative duties in the absence of the principal. Assist in any duties outlined on the principal's job description and delegated by the principal.
Stilianou, Amanda	Principal	Manages and supports teachers and staff in order to increase student achievement. Oversees budget and all faculty and staff. Responsible for accurate FTE, ESE records, and enrollment records. Includes all job duties and responsibilities set forth in the Clay County School District's job description of school principal.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Amanda Stilianou

**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.*

3

**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.*

19

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

118

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School 4-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	21%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: I (%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: I (%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	66	117	115	109	93	120	112	223	219	235	236	267	265	2177
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	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	

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/27/2020

#### Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	7	12	9	38	

#### 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	7	5	5	5	10	7	3	11	18	16	20	27	28	162
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	2	2	3	0	2	2	6	7	12	9	45

**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	81%	57%	61%	63%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	53%	59%	55%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	92%	53%	54%	64%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	67%	52%	62%	54%	47%	58%
Math Learning Gains	53%	49%	59%	49%	48%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	46%	52%	40%	42%	50%
Science Achievement	82%	54%	56%	48%	48%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	77%	78%	81%	79%	75%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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
04	2019					
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison						
05	2019					
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	64%	-64%	54%	-54%
	2018	64%	63%	1%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-64%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	74%	59%	15%	52%	22%
	2018	67%	54%	13%	51%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	88%	62%	26%	56%	32%
	2018	71%	67%	4%	58%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
09	2019	94%	61%	33%	55%	39%
	2018	69%	56%	13%	53%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison		23%				
10	2019	75%	57%	18%	53%	22%
	2018	79%	58%	21%	53%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2019					
	2018	0%	66%	-66%	62%	-62%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
05	2019					
	2018	0%	65%	-65%	61%	-61%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	70%	-70%	55%	-55%
	2018	45%	68%	-23%	52%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-45%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	79%	63%	16%	54%	25%
	2018	61%	58%	3%	54%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		34%				
08	2019	0%	49%	-49%	46%	-46%
	2018	35%	52%	-17%	45%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-35%				
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018	0%	64%	-64%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	69%	64%	5%	48%	21%
	2018	30%	67%	-37%	50%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		39%				
Cohort Comparison		69%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	72%	23%	67%	28%
2018	0%	90%	-90%	65%	-65%
Compare		95%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	80%	1%	71%	10%
2018	87%	78%	9%	71%	16%
Compare		-6%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	89%	80%	9%	70%	19%
2018	85%	78%	7%	68%	17%
Compare		4%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	65%	14%	61%	18%
2018	0%	66%	-66%	62%	-62%
Compare		79%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	64%	-17%	57%	-10%
2018	60%	61%	-1%	56%	4%
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
WHT	81	74		74	57		80	79	50	77	54
FRL	79	73		63	54						
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	29	55		27	36						
WHT	66	55	58	56	45	29	49	76	42	57	23
FRL										54	
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	29	55		27	36						
WHT	66	55	58	56	45	29	49	76	42	57	23
FRL										54	

### 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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
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	769
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94%
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
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	70
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	67
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.**

Math learning gains. Math learning gains were low across the District and the State.

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

There is no data from the previous year in which to compare.

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

We exceeded the state average in every area except for math learning gains. This was low across our District.

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

There is no data from the previous year in which to compare.

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

There is no potential areas of concern due to the areas of Focus for this data set.

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

1. Math learning gains.
2. Math achievement.
3. ELA learning gains.
4. Student participation in live lessons and tutoring sessions.
5. Improving climate and culture of the school.

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** Improve Math learning gains and math achievement

**Measurable Outcome:** Improve from 53% (2019) to 56% (2020) for math learning gains and math achievement from 67% to 70%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Math interventions will be used an evidence-based strategy to help improve math learning gains from 53% to 56%. Students will participate in weekly math interventions to help improve overall math learning gains

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Early intervention provides the best method for addressing students who are struggling with mathematics. Research has shown that intervention will help improve students' math scores and proficiency.

**Action Steps to Implement**

School Leadership Team will gather and analyze school wide data to determine which students scored low in math.

**Person Responsible** Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

School will utilize a math standards assessment.

**Person Responsible** Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

The School Leadership Team will choose a teacher to assist students who are identified as scoring below average, using math interventions strategies.

**Person Responsible** Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

The Leadership Team will continually monitor student achievement to determine improvement based on intervention strategies that are utilized.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Data will be collected and analyzed by the leadership team to determine further action steps.

**Person Responsible** Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Improve ELA learning gains This will be accomplished through using assessments to identify areas where students are scoring low to average. Teachers will develop and implement learning strategies to help students improve ELA assessment scores.

**Measurable Outcome:** Improve ELA gains from 72% (2019) to 75% for 2020.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will use the following evidence-based strategies to help improve ELA growth:  
 1. Tutoring  
 2. Teacher led activities via one on one virtual meetings with students  
 3. Analyze i-Ready Diagnostics

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Research suggests that early interventions will help students improve ELA scores. These interventions will focus on literacy skill development to help students improve literacy.

**Action Steps to Implement**

School Leadership Team will analyze school wide data to determine which students are performing below average.

**Person Responsible** Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

The School will use standards based mastery assessment to assess reading standards of students at CVA.

**Person Responsible** Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

Students identified with ELA deficiency will be referred to the Tier system to determine best intervention practices.

**Person Responsible** Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

The school leadership team will continuously monitor teachers use of interventions by checking their lesson plans and spot checking during live lessons.

**Person Responsible** Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

The school leadership team will check progress every 6 weeks to determine student progress and then determine further action steps.

**Person Responsible** Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance****Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** Improve student participation in live lessons and tutoring sessions.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Teachers will be instructed to provide live lessons for students and will set a schedule for students to be present (virtually) for the live lessons. Teachers will develop lesson plans and adhere to those lesson plans. Teachers will collect attendance of students participating in live lessons.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Teachers will utilize attendance to monitor student participation

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Teachers will interact with students during live lessons to engage students in learning lessons.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**We plan to improve student growth in math and ELA by using evidence-based strategies listed in the areas of focus. We will have teachers engage more with students through the use of live lessons to assist students attain subject mastery standards.**

**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.

Clay Virtual Academy (CVA) Leadership will promote building a positive culture and environment by providing experienced leadership teams to work closely and lead new and returning CVA teachers.

CVA Leadership will communicate promptly and effectively to address various school related topics and events to keep the CVA team abreast of school happenings.

The Leadership team will conduct monthly Professional Learning to have teachers work and learn collaboratively to better their teaching craft, emphasize positive communication with students and families and learn about new best practices in virtual education.

#### **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: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00