Polk Full Time Eschool

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Polk Full Time Eschool

604 S. CENTRAL AVE, Lakeland, FL 33815

http://schools.polk-fl.net/pvs

Demographics

Principal: Deron Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 5/26/2020

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)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: I (%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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

Polk Full Time Eschool

604 S. CENTRAL AVE, Lakeland, FL 33815

http://schools.polk-fl.net/pvs

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	0%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2014-15
Grade	I	I	C*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

To provide a high-quality education to all students allowing them to excel as successful and responsible online learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Polk Virtual School is to deliver a high-quality technology-based education that guides students to grade level proficiency, high school graduation and college and/or career preparation.

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
Williams, Deron	Principal	The Principal's duties are: *Facilitate implementation of MTSS process *Ensure students are enrolled and scheduled *Contract with state approved instruction/course providers for online learning *Create a system in which student pacing is monitored. *Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development *Analyze student data to determine achievements and opportunities for growth *Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS process *Implement tier 2 or tier 3 interventions *Conduct observations to monitor the effectiveness of instruction Each member of the school-based leadership team will analyze the data and help create and implement necessary action plans for students to show learning gains.
Hartman, Laura	Assistant Principal	The Asst. Principal's duties are: *Monitor each student's progress and pace *Attend MTSS Team meetings *Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction *Support the Implementation of tier 2 and 3 interventions *Keep progress monitoring notes and anecdotes of interventions implemented *Collect school-wide data for the team to use in determining struggling learners *Attend MTSS Team meetings for tier 2 and tier 3 students
Williams, Andrea	School Counselor	The School Counselor's duties are: *Schedule student courses appropriately *Provides expertise and support in guiding student's academically. *Participating in MTSS meetings and assisting in the creation MTSS behavior, action and support plans. *Assist MTSS team with interventions

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 5/26/2020, Deron Williams

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

21

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)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: I (%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	8	6	3	3	8	5	11	12	26	28	31	28	48	217
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	7	18	7	12	60
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	3	0	3	1	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	2	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	1	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	2	3	5	0	0	0	19
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	1	0	0	4	4	7	9	15	16	22	9	11	98

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	1	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 5/21/2020

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	9	5	4	6	7	11	16	18	34	29	33	32	40	244
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	1	1	9
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	1	1	1	7	3	7	3	1	24

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	1	3	2	1	7

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	1	0	1	2

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	9	5	4	6	7	11	16	18	34	29	33	32	40	244
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	1	1	9
One or more suspensions	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	1	1	1	7	3	7	3	1	24

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	1	3	2	1	7

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	1	0	1	2

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	0%	61%	61%	0%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	54%	0%	44%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	0%	61%	62%	0%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	56%	59%	0%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	52%	0%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	52%	56%	0%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	79%	78%	0%	68%	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	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	48%	-48%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	47%	-47%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	73%	48%	25%	54%	19%
	2018	43%	41%	2%	52%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		30%				
Cohort Comparison		73%				
07	2019	61%	42%	19%	52%	9%
	2018	39%	42%	-3%	51%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
08	2019	71%	48%	23%	56%	15%
	2018	47%	49%	-2%	58%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		32%				
09	2019	74%	45%	29%	55%	19%
	2018	45%	43%	2%	53%	-8%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		29%				
Cohort Comparison		27%				
10	2019	55%	42%	13%	53%	2%
	2018	62%	42%	20%	53%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	0%	56%	-56%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	56%	-56%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	51%	-51%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	47%	-47%	55%	-55%
	2018	33%	40%	-7%	52%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-33%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	75%	39%	36%	54%	21%
	2018	33%	40%	-7%	54%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		42%				
Cohort Comparison		42%				
08	2019	29%	35%	-6%	46%	-17%
	2018	0%	34%	-34%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		29%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	0%	45%	-45%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	37%	41%	-4%	48%	-11%
	2018	33%	42%	-9%	50%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		37%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	54%	-2%	67%	-15%
2018	64%	59%	5%	65%	-1%
Compare		-12%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	80%	70%	10%	71%	9%
2018	0%	84%	-84%	71%	-71%
Compare		80%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	29%	50%	-21%	61%	-32%
2018	50%	60%	-10%	62%	-12%
Compare		-21%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	53%	8%	57%	4%
2018	50%	41%	9%	56%	-6%
Compare		11%			

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
BLK	64										
HSP	75	70		62	45						

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	69	56		57	43		44	55			
FRL	53	53		47	44						
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
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	348
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	73%
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	
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	64
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
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	
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	54
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	49
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.

Our lowest performance data come from the Algebra 1 EOC. Only 29% of our students achieved level 3 or above base do the 2018-19 state test data.

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

The data component with the greatest decline was Algebra 1. Based on last year's data, 58% of the students achieved a level 3 or above. Based on the 2018-19 state test data only 29% of ours students achieved level 3 or above.

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.

The component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is percent of students tested for FSA/EOC. For the 2018-19 school had 73% for the students participate in state testing. The state average is above 96%. Polk Virtual's students live in all parts of Polk County. Many of our families have one or no transportation. As a school, last year we did not have a hard policy tying enrollment to state testing. Many of the families made excuses as to why they were not able to show up for testing.

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

The component with the greatest improvement is 7th grade math. Based on the 2017-18 school year data 33% of the students achieved a level 3 or above. In the 2018-19 school year, 75% of the students achieved a level 3 or above.

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

Looking at the EWS data, we want decrease the number of student achieving a level 1 in ELA and Math as well as the number of students that are failing ELA and Math courses.

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

1. Increasing our percent tested for FSA and EOCs from 73% to 95% or above.
2. Increase the level of achievement for our Algebra 1 students at level 3 or above from 29% to
3. Only 33% of students in grade 7 achieved a level 3 or above on the Math FSA
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Testing Population

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing the percent of students participating in the state assessment to at least 95%. The state requires that at least 95% of the school's tested population participate in the state assessments. The 2018-19 school year Polk Virtual School had only 73% of the testing population participate. As a result we received a letter grade of an "I". When all students don't participate in testing we don't have accurate data.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase the percent of students participating in state testing from 73% to at least 95%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deron Williams (deron.williams@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Make parents and students aware that testing is a requirement and not an option as well as when and where their individual testing will be offered. It is our goal to provide our parents and students with every opportunity to participate in state testing.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence shows that participation increases when people are aware of the goal. It is our intention to ensure that parents and students understand that participating in state testing is a requirement for enrollment into the virtual school and that participation in state testing will have a direct influence on enrollment the next year school. We will communicate this with all new and existing parents during out parent information meetings. Parents and students are required to sign the agreement policy which identifies our testing policy.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students and parents must sign the enrollment agreement. The agreement contains the testing mandatory testing policy.
2. During the summer, new parent/students informational meetings will be held. In these meetings parents/students will be told the mandatory testing policy and provided the testing agreement.
a. Teachers will post the mandatory testing policy on their virtual pages
b. Students will be assigned Homeroom teachers that will serve as the contact person to help in the communication of testing for students.
c. Zone schools will receive the secure testing documents for students at least two weeks prior to testing.
3. The testing schedules for the district were mailed to all parents during the second week of school.
a. Parents/Students will be notified of the specific date, time and location for each test.
b. During our monthly students Face to Face meetings we will continually

Person Responsible	Deron Williams (deron.williams@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Listed several times in list of school-wide improvement priorities is the lower testing results related to the subject of math. The result for students testing in math grades and Algebra 1 have been low. We must increase our ability to provide instruction and remediation virtually that meets the needs of our students. This means being able to pull students into small group through virtual platforms. Students that need to remediation can have the one on one needed to be successful. The leadership team will be monitoring our teachers pull small groups. Teachers will be using apps to schedule individual and small sessions with students that are in need of extra support. This will also provide the leadership team an opportunity to provide support or professional development to the teacher if needed. PLCs will also provide the Leadership Team and teachers the opportunity to review, develop, implement strategies that will support learning. The students of Polk Virtual will also be administered the STAR assessment. We will be able to monitor the student's progress and provide support based on this data.

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.

This school year Polk Virtual will seek to establish a SAC committee.

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: Other: Testing Population	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**