

The School Board of Highlands County

Highlands Virtual School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 24 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 30 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 30 |

Highlands Virtual School

426 SCHOOL ST, Sebring, FL 33870

<https://sites.google.com/highlands.k12.fl.us/hvs>

Demographics

Principal: Page Green

Start Date for this Principal: 12/22/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 49% |
| 2020-21 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: No Grade |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |

* 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 Highlands County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 24 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 30 |

Highlands Virtual School

426 SCHOOL ST, Sebring, FL 33870

<https://sites.google.com/highlands.k12.fl.us/hvs>

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| Combination School KG-12 | No | 53% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 61% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | C | C | B |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Highlands 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.

Highlands Virtual School will partner with students, families, and the community to empower students to be self-motivated learners who embrace digital literacy to achieve academic mastery and foster lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering students to be independent lifelong learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Graham, Rita | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Goudge, Erin | Assistant Principal | |
| Green, Page | Instructional Coach | MTSS |
| Riley, Kim | Principal | |
| Taylor, Micah | Math Coach | |
| Ramos, Stephanie | Science Coach | |
| Pierce, Margaret | Teacher, K-12 | Related Arts |
| Hunter, Rhonda | Teacher, K-12 | Social Studies |
| Sutton, Daniele | Reading Coach | |
| Hendrick, Stefanie | Teacher, ESE | |
| Langston, Jennifer | School Counselor | |
| Gordon, Rebecca | Dean | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 12/22/2020, Page Green

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Total number of students enrolled at the school

325

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

0

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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 | 9 | 11 | 22 | 11 | 14 | 28 | 18 | 32 | 31 | 22 | 35 | 42 | 50 | 325 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 6 | 13 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 11 | 13 | 18 | 110 |
| 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 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 24 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 36 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 40 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 46 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 13 | 65 |

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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 8 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/26/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 104 | 102 | 93 | 91 | 112 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 608 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 24 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| One or more suspensions | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 24 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| Course failure in ELA | 35 | 18 | 4 | 25 | 19 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |
| Course failure in Math | 28 | 10 | 7 | 14 | 43 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 28 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |

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 | 15 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 39 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

2020-21 - 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 | 104 | 102 | 93 | 91 | 112 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 608 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 24 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| One or more suspensions | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 24 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| Course failure in ELA | 35 | 18 | 4 | 25 | 19 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |
| Course failure in Math | 28 | 10 | 7 | 14 | 43 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 28 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |

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 | 15 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 39 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 62% | 62% | 61% | 62% | 62% | 60% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 41% | 41% | 59% | 58% | 58% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | 54% | | | 52% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 44% | 44% | 62% | 40% | 40% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 36% | 36% | 59% | 47% | 47% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | 52% | | | 52% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 55% | 55% | 56% | 70% | 70% | 57% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 63% | 63% | 78% | | | 77% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 44% | -44% | 54% | -54% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 40% | -40% | 52% | -52% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 46% | -46% | 56% | -56% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 46% | -46% | 55% | -55% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 43% | -3% | 53% | -13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 44% | -44% | 55% | -55% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 49% | -49% | 54% | -54% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 44% | -44% | 46% | -46% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 41% | -41% | 48% | -48% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 40% | 54% | -14% | 67% | -27% |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 60% | -60% | 71% | -71% |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 58% | 63% | -5% | 70% | -12% |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 52% | -52% | 61% | -61% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 55% | -55% | 57% | -57% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tools that will be used are iReady, Common Lit, Achieve 3,000, along with district common assessments.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Civics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 12 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 3 | 19 | 21 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 18 | | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 43 | | 16 | 24 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 43 | 21 | 14 | 27 | 31 | 33 | 32 | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 41 | 38 | 28 | 20 | 27 | 48 | 50 | | | |
| MUL | 56 | 47 | | 46 | 27 | | | | | | |

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| WHT | 53 | 50 | 29 | 30 | 24 | 17 | 67 | 58 | | 95 | 32 |
| FRL | 43 | 42 | 32 | 22 | 23 | 29 | 53 | 37 | | 90 | 33 |
| 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 | 65 | 54 | | 46 | | | | 54 | | | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | 50 | | | |
| 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 | 57 | 62 | | 46 | | | | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 44 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 485 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 76% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 13 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 29 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |

| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 29 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 38 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 46 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 40 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Math achievement is overall the lower performing area when looking across grade levels 4-12. Sixth grade is a higher performing grade level in math but the rest are below district and state average.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Tier 2 and 3 interventions and support are identified to need the greatest need for improvement to support improved math achievement across multiple grade levels.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The student criteria for enrollment change led to the need for more intervention. Teachers were new to this learning platform and due to not having a full staff or structures in place everyone had to take on additional responsibilities. Specific actions to address this need are: we now are fully staffed so there is a shift in expectations for teachers, modeling and supporting the change and focus of Tier 1 support in synchronous sessions, focus of PLCs, identifying students in need of intervention, modeling instruction and supporting intervention teachers, monitoring student success during intervention and using better (new) math curriculum (FLVS) across all grade levels.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA achievement in 4th 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th showed the most improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Through the curriculum in all subjects students use their reading and writing skills. Writing across content areas was a major focus of the school.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Strategies to implement to accelerate learning is a focus on tier 1 support for students to have a strong foundation of the learning. We will also have promotion and encouragement of advanced and accelerated courses. Also having more accelerated course offerings available to students.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will be provided to teachers and staff on focusing on core instruction and tier 1 support.

We will also keep staff aware of the availability of accelerated courses and how to encourage accelerated courses to students. The specific teachers of the accelerated courses will also need to receive professional development on the development of additional accelerated courses to add to our course directory.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The largest implementation will be the PLC process and identifying areas where students need support. Changing the instruction to include more synchronous sessions to provide that tier 1 support. Also through MTSS closely monitoring of the tier 2 and 3 students in ELA and Math and having a focus on intensive interventions. The use of a new curriculum (FLVS) and learning management system (Canvas) will be implemented.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Looking at our data, we identified math learning gains as critical area of academic need
Description and Rationale: to ensure that we are preparing all of our students to be college, career, and workplace ready.

Measurable Outcome: HVS will increase its math learning gains by 5% from an overall 23% to 28%.

Monitoring: This area of need will be monitored by targeting specific students needs and providing intervention and instruction on those areas. We will also monitor growth through students baseline diagnostics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Micah Taylor (taylorm@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Tier 2 and 3 pull out interventions will be used to implement this area of focus.
 School-Wide AVID Initiative
 AVID Focused Notes/Note-taking strategies
 Use of Instructional Math Coach
 Use of Instructional Practice Guides to provide feedback to teachers and to identify areas of instructional and curriculum needs
 Use of new FLVS curriculum
 MTSS- Tier 2 and 3 remediation

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy was selected so that students will receive instruction on their specific skill need to further their learning gains in math. The MTSS process is a proven research-based approach that has been encouraged by the district.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use of district-developed curriculum maps and progress monitoring
2. Data-driven chats with math coach
3. Professional development such as AVID Trainings, Summer Institutes, College Board AP , district coaches meetings, schoolwide professional development plan, support facilitation and national literacy professional development (Achieve 3000), BEST standards trainings
4. Work in PLCs will allow for teachers to collaborate on assessments and lessons resulting from analysis of student performance data.
5. Monthly MTSS meetings, weekly data collection and a focus on Tier 2 and 3 supports
6. Completing classroom walk throughs using the IPG tool
7. Stock Take team will meet monthly to discuss the feedback and determine areas of need and next steps.

Person Responsible Micah Taylor (taylorm@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Looking at our data we identified learning gains in ELA as a critical area due to being under 50% successful. Student's academic success help ensure we are preparing all of our students to be college, career, and workplace ready.

Measurable Outcome: HVS will increase its ELA learning gains by 3% from an overall 45% to 48%.

Monitoring: This area of need will be monitored by targeting specific students needs and providing intervention and instruction on those areas. We will also monitor growth through students baseline diagnostics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Daniele Sutton (suttond@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Tier 2 and 3 pull out interventions will be used to implement this area of focus.
 School-Wide AVID Initiative
 AVID Focused Notes/Note-taking strategies
 Use of Reading Coach
 Use of Instructional Practice Guides to provide feedback to teachers and to identify areas of instructional and curriculum needs
 Use of new FLVS curriculum
 MTSS- Tier 2 and 3 remediation

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy was selected so that students will receive instruction on their specific skill need to further their learning gains in math. The MTSS process is a proven research-based approach that has been encouraged by the district.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use of district-developed curriculum maps and progress monitoring
2. Data-driven chats with reading coach
3. Professional development such as AVID Trainings, Summer Institutes, College Board AP , district coaches meetings, schoolwide professional development plan, support facilitation and national literacy professional development (Achieve 3000), BEST standards trainings
4. Work in PLCs will allow for the Development/implementation of common formative and summative assessments
5. Monthly MTSS meetings, weekly data collection via AIMS web Plus
6. Completing classroom walk throughs using the IPG tool
7. Stock Take team will meet monthly to discuss the feedback and determine areas of need and next steps.

Person Responsible Daniele Sutton (suttond@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: College and Career Acceleration was identified as a critical area of need due to having under 50% of students meeting this criteria. Ensuring all students take at least 1 advanced placement, dual enrollment course or pass an industry certification is necessary to ensure we are preparing our students to be college, career and workplace ready.

Measurable Outcome: HVS will increase its College and Career Acceleration by 5% from 33% to 38%.

Monitoring: Percentage of students passing acceleration courses will be monitored throughout the year. Students will be encouraged to enroll in acceleration courses when they meet the criteria to do so. Students will be encouraged to attend college/career fairs offered in the district.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stefanie Hendrick (hendrics@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: PLC time will be utilized to maximize common assessments and examination of student data to improve instruction in acceleration courses.

AP Summer Institute--several teachers attended

AVID School

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: PLCs are proven research-based approach that has been implemented nationally and has been encouraged by the district. Avid helps focus students on college and career readiness skills and encourages advanced level coursework.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Student data will be collected and examined throughout the year to determine achievement in accelerated courses and to determine which students should be encouraged to take these courses.
2. Teachers will collaborate on assessments and lessons resulting from analysis of student performance data and attend AP Summer Institute through College Board and AVID trainings (Professional Development).
3. Interventions will specifically target students in Tier 3 and Tier 4 for additional supports
4. Events to increase family involvement are also necessary to inform families and will be held virtually
5. Use of PSAT results to determine AP Potential
6. Stock Take team will meet monthly to discuss the feedback and determine areas of need and next steps.

Person Responsible Stefanie Hendrick (hendrics@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After looking at our data we identified our risk level 3 and 4 students as a critical area of need due to the high percentage of students in that category.

Measurable Outcome: To decrease the % of students in Risk level 4 in Math from 19% to 14% and in Risk Level 3 and 4 in ELA from 22% to 17% (Based on End of Year 2021 Diagnostic 3 Data)

Monitoring: This area of need will be monitored by targeting specific students needs and providing intervention and instruction on those areas. We will also monitor growth through students baseline diagnostics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Page Green (greenp@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Tier 2 and 3 pull out interventions will be used to implement this area of focus. The students will be specifically targeted and monitored through the MTSS process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy was selected so that students will receive instruction on their specific skill need to further their learning gains in math. The MTSS process is a proven research-based approach that has been encouraged by the district.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Student diagnostic data will be collected and analyzed three time a year.
2. Student achievement will be analyzed throughout the year, in PLC and MTSS monthly meetings to determine achievement progress, for risk level 3 and 4 students.
3. Monthly probing will be conducted on those risk level 3 and 4 students.
4. MTSS team will meet monthly to look at specific students for intervention support.
5. Interventions will specifically target students in risk level 3 and 4.
6. Stock Take team will meet monthly to discuss the feedback and determine areas of need and next steps.

Person Responsible Page Green (greenp@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: After reviewing our data we identified attendance as a critical area of need due to students inconsistently logging into their online coursework and because there was not a well developed system in place for taking, recording and monitoring attendance.

Measurable Outcome: 75% of our students will be present for more than 90% of time.

Monitoring: Student attendance will be monitored and recorded weekly based on the expectation that students must login daily to each of their required courses. Weekly reporting will be done to monitor attendance and address areas of concern.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rebecca Gordon (gordonr@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: SARC
 Positive behavior incentives (i.e. perfect attendance awards)
 Daily recording of attendance (entered weekly in Skyward)
 Skyward reporting
 MTSS
 Relationships with discretionary agencies (Youth and Family Services, Project 10)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order for students to be engaged and involved in their academics they must attend regularly. We will take a systematic approach to taking, recording, and monitoring attendance and then using the SARC process to address concerns as they arise. Student attendance will also be taken into consideration during monthly MTSS meetings and for students to remain enrolled in HVS as a school of choice.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Student attendance will be monitored weekly by dean and admin
2. Dean reaches out to non-attendeess for parent/student meetings with administration.
3. SARC process is followed with support from student services
4. Dean holds tutoring sessions for students who have been absent and falling behind in courses to assist with logging in to their courses and completing school work.
5. Dean works with students in study skills sessions by creating schedules, setting up contact with teachers, completing work.
6. Students have opportunity to earn awards for attendance quarterly

Person Responsible Rebecca Gordon (gordonr@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

School is not listed on report and is also not listed on non-reporting school. As a virtual school, 56 of the 60 total referrals written last year were written because of copying/cheating/plagiarism or internet policy violations.

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.

Communication is a goal for our school to improve positive school culture and environment. Teachers work each day to communicate with students individually about their coursework. The school has adopted a new learning management system with a parent/observer app so parents can see what students are completing in their courses and receive copies of messages from teachers to their student. For school wide announcements and information the school uses social media and the school wide app encouraged by the district.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The administration, faculty, and staff have worked and are working on improving relationships with our students, parents, and the community. Listed below are some examples of activities and strategies HVS is going to use to create a better culture.

1. SAC meetings
2. Student of the month
3. Social Media Postings
4. AVID Strategy
5. Parent App
6. Test Prep Bootcamps
7. Teacher Appreciation Week
8. National Literacy Week
9. Social Meet Up Activities
10. Parent Curriculum Night

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: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |