

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 14 |
| Planning for Improvement | 29 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 35 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 35 |

Florida Cyber Charter Academy At Osceola

9143 PHILLIPS HWY SUITE 590, Jacksonville, FL 32256

https://flcca.k12.com/

Demographics

Principal: Jerry Hulshult

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

| 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) | 53% |
| 2020-21 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: C (41%) 2017-18: D (33%) 2016-17: C (45%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Inf | ormation* |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. F | or more information, <u>click here</u> . |
| | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola 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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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 | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 14 |
| Planning for Improvement | 29 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 35 |

Florida Cyber Charter Academy At Osceola

9143 PHILLIPS HWY SUITE 590, Jacksonville, FL 32256

https://flcca.k12.com/

School Demographics

| School Type and Gr (per MSID F | | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvant | Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Combination S KG-12 | School | No | | 70% | | | | | |
| Primary Servic (per MSID F | •• | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) | | | | | |
| K-12 General Ec | ducation | Yes | | 67% | | | | | |
| School Grades Histo | ry | | | | | | | | |
| Year Grade | 2020-21 | 2019-20 C | 2018-19 C | 2017-18 D | | | | | |
| School Board Approv | val | | | | | | | | |

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola 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.

Ensuring all students reach their full potential by utilizing a highly effective curriculum and implementing classes that are student-centered, data driven, and engaging for all learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Celebrating diversity and building community through inspiration while ensuring our students are productive citizens today for successful in their future endeavors of tomorrow.

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 |
|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Sheffield, Samantha | Principal | Ensures conformance of educational programs to state and local school board standards through evaluation, development and coordination activities; As needed, researches and implements non-K12 curriculum resources that meet state standards; Manages teaching and administrative staff; Helps articulate the school's mission and vision with the aim of ensuring all stakeholders have a common understanding and are positioned to work cooperatively in order to achieve desired results; Utilizes/relies heavily upon communication technologies and practices that most effectively support a predominantly virtual / remote work environment; Confers with teachers, students, and parents concerning educational and behavioral problems in school; Coordinates with teacher and K12 Enrollment regarding expulsions and withdrawals; Ensures that the school is meeting the needs of students while complying with local, state, and federal laws, including laws pertaining to special education; Develops and oversees implementation of the school's Academic Improvement Plan. Directly supervises 20-30 Full-time Equivalent (FTE) regular employees and/or contractors. Establishes and promotes high standards and expectations for all students and staff for academic performance and responsibility for behavior. Manages, evaluates and supervises effective and clear procedures for the operation and functioning of the school consistent with the philosophy, mission, values and goals of the school including instructional programs, extracurricular activities, discipline systems to ensure a safe and orderly climate, program evaluation, personnel management, office operations, and emergency procedures. Establishes the annual master schedule for instructional goals. Supervises the instructional programs of the school, evaluating lesson plans and observing classes on a regular basis to e |
| White, Bridget | Other | Provides leadership and coordination to provide an aligned and articulated instructional assessment, accountability, and data analysis program for the school. Develops and delivers professional development to adult learners Administration of local and state assessment programs Coordination and compliance of state and federal accountability programs |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | Coordinates the review, development, and revision of all procedures related to the administration of local and state assessments. Works cooperatively with the principal/s in developing and supervising the procedures for administering local and state assessments. Coordinates the ordering and use of all local and state assessment materials. Provide evaluative findings including student achievement data for the review of curriculum and instruction program effectiveness. Assists in the preparation of the budget and administration of same for supplies, equipment, and facilities in areas of student assessment. Plans and provides staff development for teachers, administrators, and staff on requirements of the state assessment program and the state and federal accountability programs. Disseminates information regarding current requirements of the state assessment program including test administration, security, and confidentiality. Assists in communicating information to parent and community members about local and state assessments and state and federal accountability. |
| Myers, Catherine | Other | Provides leadership and coordination for all special education and other special programs. Assists with resolving issues regarding staff/ parents/ students in special programs. Provides leadership with the development of program design, special materials, curriculum, and methods. Coordinates and prepares documentation needed to respond on behalf of the school Coordinates and facilitate special programs audits Develops and promotes parent education and support programs to foster increased levels of parental satisfaction with programs and services Monitors quality of Individual Educational Plans (IEPs), Educational Plans (EPs), Service Plans, Transition Plans and Matrix of Services for all programs Provides consultation for staffing and placement of exceptional students. Coordinates the continual evaluation of the quality of special education programs and personnel. Supervises assigned personnel, conducts annual performance appraisals, and make recommendations for appropriate employment action. 1 Maintains information for special education programs to meet local, state and federal audits. Develops and plans for department budget. Recruits and monitors new ESE employees. Prepares or oversee the preparation of all required reports and maintain appropriate records. Assists in implementing the District's goals and strategic commitments. |
| Moore, Lauren | Instructional Coach | ~Provide organized, individual and/or group learning opportunities for teachers as needed. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | Demonstrate knowledge using a variety of assessment tools. Demonstrate a thorough knowledge of curriculum and subject matter. Provide support in analyzing student assessment data. Assist teachers with designing instructional decisions based on assessment data. Assist teachers with specific classroom activities when requested. Provide support for classroom motivation and management strategies. Assist teachers in creating materials that are in alignment with curriculum. Monitor intervention programs by observing and meeting with teachers. Provide teachers Internet links related to instruction and curriculum. Instruct and support teachers with curriculum software products, and classroom/curriculum related technologies. Provide encouragement and emotional support to teachers. Model lessons when appropriate. Provide encouragement and emotional support to teachers. Kanage time and schedule flexibility that maximizes teacher schedules and learning. Work positively toward meeting identified district and building improvement goals. Assist with development of district curriculum, instruction and assessments. Develop and maintain a confidential, collegial relationship with teachers. Possess an understanding of when to contact administrators regarding issues of safety/ethics involving students in classroom observed. |
| Simmering, Thomas | Assistant Principal | ~ Ensures conformance of educational programs to state and local school board standards through evaluation, development and coordination activities; ~ As needed, researches and implements non-K12 curriculum resources that meet state standards; ~ Manages teaching and administrative staff; ~ Helps articulate the school's mission and vision with the aim of ensuring all stakeholders have a common understanding and are positioned to work cooperatively in order to achieve desired results; ~ Utilizes/relies heavily upon communication technologies and practices that most effectively support a predominantly virtual / remote work environment; ~ Confers with teachers, students, and parents concerning educational and behavioral problems in school; ~ Coordinates with teacher and K12 Enrollment regarding expulsions and withdrawals; ~ Ensures that the school is meeting the needs of students while complying with local, state, and federal laws, including laws pertaining to special education; ~ Develops and oversees implementation of the school's Academic Improvement Plan. ~ Directly supervises 20-30 Full-time Equivalent (FTE) regular employees |

| Name Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | and/or contractors. Establishes and promotes high standards and expectations for all students and staff for academic performance and responsibility for behavior. Manages, evaluates and supervises effective and clear procedures for the operation and functioning of the school consistent with the philosophy, mission, values and goals of the school including instructional programs, extracurricular activities, discipline systems to ensure a safe and orderly climate, program evaluation, personnel management, office operations, and emergency procedures. Establishes the annual master schedule for instructional programs, ensuring sequential learning experiences for students consistent with the school's philosophy, mission statement and instructional goals. Supervises the instructional programs of the school, evaluating lesson plans and observing classes on a regular basis to encourage the use of a variety of instructional strategies and materials consistent with research on learning and child growth and development. Files all required state reports regarding violence, vandalism, attendance and discipline matters. Carries out supervisory responsibilities in accordance with the organization's policies and applicable laws. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Jerry Hulshult

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.

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,038

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

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year. 16

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

| Indiastar | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 101 | 93 | 140 | 127 | 133 | 123 | 117 | 109 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1057 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 12 | 15 | 11 | 14 | 14 | 10 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 4 | 2 | 23 | 34 | 55 | 44 | 14 | 38 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 254 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 3 | 15 | 26 | 33 | 41 | 10 | 22 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 22 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indiantor | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indiantan | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/24/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Osceola - 0153 - Florida Cyber Charter Academy At Osceola - 2021-22 SIP

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 60 | 34 | 55 | 40 | 44 | 52 | 107 | 88 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 588 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 16 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 18 | 19 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 14 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 17 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| 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 | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | ve | I | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Totai |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indiantan | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | ve | I | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator | | | | | | Gra | de Lo | evel | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-------|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Number of students enrolled | 60 | 34 | 55 | 40 | 44 | 52 | 107 | 88 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 588 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 16 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 18 | 19 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 14 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 17 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| 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 | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | vel | I | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| le dia stan | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | eve | | | | | Tatal |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 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 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 Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 42% | 56% | 61% | 39% | 58% | 60% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 48% | 57% | 59% | 42% | 58% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 41% | 55% | 54% | 40% | 52% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 24% | 52% | 62% | 27% | 52% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 34% | 55% | 59% | 29% | 54% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 36% | 49% | 52% | 24% | 50% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 36% | 49% | 56% | 41% | 54% | 57% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 44% | 75% | 78% | 43% | 71% | 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 Comparisor |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 51% | -1% | 58% | -8% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 29% | 51% | -22% | 58% | -29% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -50% | | | • | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 42% | 48% | -6% | 56% | -14% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -29% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 48% | -9% | 54% | -15% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -42% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 47% | -6% | 52% | -11% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -39% | | | · · | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |

| | | | ELA | | | |
|-------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 40% | 49% | -9% | 56% | -16% |
| Cohort Corr | nparison | -41% | | | | |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 47% | -12% | 55% | -20% |
| Cohort Corr | nparison | -40% | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 47% | -3% | 53% | -9% |
| Cohort Corr | nparison | -35% | | | | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 27% | 54% | -27% | 62% | -35% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 14% | 53% | -39% | 64% | -50% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -27% | | | • | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 14% | 48% | -34% | 60% | -46% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -14% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 18% | 45% | -27% | 55% | -37% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -14% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 32% | 30% | 2% | 54% | -22% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -18% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 16% | 47% | -31% | 46% | -30% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -32% | | | · · | |

| | | | SCIENC | CE | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 25% | 45% | -20% | 53% | -28% |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 34% | 42% | -8% | 48% | -14% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -25% | | | | |

| | | BIOLO | GY EOC | | |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 47% | 62% | -15% | 67% | -20% |
| | | CIVIC | SEOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 43% | 73% | -30% | 71% | -28% |
| | | HISTO | RY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 47% | 62% | -15% | 70% | -23% |
| | | ALGEB | RA EOC | · · · | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 33% | 49% | -16% | 61% | -28% |
| | | GEOME | TRY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 24% | 44% | -20% | 57% | -33% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

NWEA was administered in the 2020-2021 school year for all students K-8 in reading and math.

| | | Grade 1 | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 75.4 | 81 | 77 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 81 | 82 | 76 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 55 | 44 | 40 |
| | English Language Learners | 20 | 66.7 | 62 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 56 | 74.8 | 76 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 47 | 45 | 67 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 50 | 0 | 66 |
| | English Language Learners | 62 | 63 | 63 |
| | | | | |
| | | Grade 2 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Grade 2 Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 67 | Spring 64 |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 74.5 | 67 | 64 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | Fall 74.5 73 | 67 60 | 64 62 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency | Fall 74.5 73 60 60 Fall | 67 60 66.7 50 Winter | 64 62 42 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 74.5 73 60 60 | 67 60 66.7 50 | 64 62 42 28 |
| | ProficiencyAll StudentsEconomicallyDisadvantagedStudents WithDisabilitiesEnglish LanguageLearnersNumber/%ProficiencyAll StudentsEconomicallyDisadvantaged | Fall 74.5 73 60 60 Fall | 67 60 66.7 50 Winter | 64 62 42 28 Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 74.5 73 60 60 Fall 78.7 | 67 60 66.7 50 Winter 76 | 64 62 42 28 Spring 64 |

| | | Grade 3 | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | | | | | |
| | All Students | 73 | 70 | 61 | | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 67.8 | 63 | 52 | | | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 53 | 58 | 61 | | | | | |
| | English Language Learners | 42.8 | 0 | 66 | | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | | | | | |
| | All Students | 59 | 64.6 | 55 | | | | | |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 53.7 | 45 | 50 | | | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33 | 22 | 383 | | | | | |
| | English Language Learners | 57 | 62 | 33 | | | | | |
| | Grade 4 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students | Fall 72.3 | Winter 65.3 | Spring 52 | | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | 72.3 | 65.3 | 52 | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 72.3 66.6 | 65.3 63 | 52 52 | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency | 72.3 66.6 28.5 66.6 Fall | 65.3 63 33 0 Winter | 52 52 32 33 Spring | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | 72.3 66.6 28.5 66.6 | 65.3 63 33 0 | 52 52 32 33 | | | | | |
| | ProficiencyAll StudentsEconomicallyDisadvantagedStudents WithDisabilitiesEnglish LanguageLearnersNumber/%ProficiencyAll StudentsEconomicallyDisadvantaged | 72.3 66.6 28.5 66.6 Fall | 65.3 63 33 0 Winter | 52 52 32 33 Spring | | | | | |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | 72.3 66.6 28.5 66.6 Fall 56 | 65.3 63 33 0 Winter 57 | 52 52 32 33 Spring 46 | | | | | |

| | | Grade 5 | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 79.6 | 65 | 51 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 79.2 | 58 | 41 |
| 7415 | Students With Disabilities | 66.7 | 46 | 15 |
| | English Language Learners | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 55 | 44 | 38 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 52 | 47 | 31 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 58 | 46 | 40 |
| | English Language Learners | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 57.1 | 48 | 44 |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | 49 | 48 | 42 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 50 | 40 | 39 |
| | English Language Learners | 100 | 100 | 50 |
| | | Grade 6 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 60.4 | 43 | 37 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 61.5 | 37 | 33 |
| 740 | Students With Disabilities | 40 | 7 | 17 |
| | English Language Learners | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 45.2 | 42.4 | 35 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 43 | 39 | 24 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20 | 21 | 12 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | Grade 7 | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 51 | 56.8 | 46 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 62.6 | 56.8 | 54 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15 | 18 | 17 |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 59.4 | 51.9 | 32 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 54 | 48.8 | 29 |
| | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 15 | 0 | 13 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Civics | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| | | Grade 8 | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 58.3 | 65.1 | 47 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 51.6 | 62.7 | 45 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 29.4 | 50 | 35 |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 48.6 | 53.5 | 39 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 41.8 | 46.5 | 28 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 29.4 | 43.7 | 26 |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 42.9 | 41 | 43 |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | 41 | 39 | 42 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 21 | 22 | 23 |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| | | Grade 9 | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | 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 | | | |

| | | Grade 10 | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|--------|
| | 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 | | | |

| | | Grade 11 | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|--------|
| | 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 | | | |

| | | 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 | | | |

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 | 11 | 26 | 32 | 4 | 28 | 48 | 13 | | | 60 | |
| ELL | 10 | 27 | | 10 | 33 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 40 | 38 | 10 | 31 | 44 | 27 | 40 | | 81 | 8 |
| HSP | 39 | 39 | 39 | 23 | 35 | 52 | 32 | 44 | | 74 | 7 |
| MUL | 60 | 33 | | 47 | 42 | | | | | | |

| | | 2021 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | 45 | 34 | 39 | 28 | 29 | 40 | 47 | 47 | | 86 | 14 |
| FRL | 33 | 35 | 35 | 18 | 32 | 46 | 33 | 37 | | 88 | 14 |
| | | 2019 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 14 | 31 | 42 | 2 | 45 | 50 | | 28 | | | |
| ELL | 20 | 25 | | 20 | 25 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 49 | 50 | 23 | 33 | 26 | 31 | 43 | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 42 | 33 | 20 | 30 | 36 | 21 | 38 | | 70 | |
| MUL | 61 | 67 | | 29 | 33 | | 71 | 27 | | | |
| WHT | 41 | 49 | 41 | 25 | 36 | 42 | 41 | 49 | 32 | 79 | 55 |
| FRL | 38 | 46 | 42 | 22 | 34 | 36 | 31 | 41 | 50 | | |
| | | 2018 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 16 | 35 | 31 | 3 | 17 | | 20 | 10 | | | |
| ASN | 85 | | | 77 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 44 | 55 | 17 | 20 | 21 | 36 | 23 | | | |
| HSP | 33 | 41 | 48 | 22 | 27 | 38 | 25 | 48 | | | |
| MUL | 50 | 44 | | 21 | 22 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 42 | 40 | 30 | 30 | 32 | 20 | 52 | 46 | 16 | | |
| FRL | 48 | 40 | 33 | 25 | 30 | 33 | 34 | 30 | 18 | | |

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 | 39 | | | | |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES | | | | |
| 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 | 428 | | | | |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 | | | | |
| Percent Tested | 82% | | | | |
| Subgroup Data | | | | | |
| Students With Disabilities | | | | | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 28 | | | | |

Osceola - 0153 - Florida Cyber Charter Academy At Osceola - 2021-22 SIP

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 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 | 20 |
| 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 | 35 |
| 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 | 46 |
| 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 | 41 | | |
| 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 | 37 | | |
| 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?

Overall, Math proficiency is the lowest component of our school grade. Contributing factors were 3rd and 7th grade showing a decline in YOY proficiency by 10%(3rd) and 5%(7th). However, learning gains for our bottom 25 increased by 10% from 2018-2019. We believe this increase is a result of additional resources being targeted for mathematics instruction. Additionally, our SWD subgroup continues to have the lowest performance across content areas and gains, however, both proficiency and gains have shown increases by over 10%.

There continues to be a need for overall mathematics improvement, and for professional development in specific grade levels on high-impact strategies in core content areas. Teacher training on content pedagogy combined with focused data driven instruction will reflect increased achievement and learning gains across all grade levels.

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

In comparison to the 2019 FSA data, our student showed the greatest need for improvement in mathematics. While proficiency only decreased by 1%, proficiency across grade levels is still far below district and state averages.

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

Due to the interruption of learning that COVID has caused with increased absences continual changes with students' modality, the students experienced learning gaps in their instruction. In order to combat the learning loss, we will refine MTSS eligibility criteria to proactively target student learning gaps, increase rigor of core instruction, and progress monitoring regularly.

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

The data components with the most improvement were our BQ learning gains in mathematics, and 5th grade science achievement. Both components increased by 10%+.

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

FLCCA placed a heavy focus on mathematics instructions which included a fact fluency program for students to master basic operations which allowed for more time to be spent on conceptual mathematics thinking and application. Additionally, teachers and instructional leadership worked closely with a mathematics consultant to build teacher pedagogy and targeting high impact instructional strategies.

In 5th grade science, gaps in curriculum content were identified and supplemented with highly aligned content to support instruction.

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

To continue accelerating learning, high impact strategies will need to be consistently implemented in all core subject areas. Accelerated learning strategies will include: Scaffolding Intentionally; Building vocabulary; Targeted small group; Prioritizing standards; Incorporating Text Sets.

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 opportunities will be provided to teachers via differentiation based on current student outcomes and teacher pedagogy. Teachers will receive ongoing support on instructional strategies and data from progress monitoring programs to drive instructional decisions. In addition, peer observations will be conducted to enhance their teaching strategies and content knowledge. Teachers have access to PD modules offered by Osceola.

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

Ongoing progress monitoring by the leadership team will be conducted monthly to assess current performance, needs analysis, and action plan for continued improvement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | The instructional leadership team helps maintain a cohesive and focused vision on student learning and achievement. Effective instructional leadership teams are powerful levers for making change in schools. As our leadership team expands and we add new members, it is important that all team members have a shared vision and consistency across instructional implementation and feedback. |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Measurable Outcome: | Increase the opportunity to pursue leadership roles by 10% from 20-21 to 21-22. |
| Monitoring: | This area of focus will be monitored by school administrator review of teacher pulse check survey section responses quarterly. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Samantha Sheffield (samantha.sheffield@osceolaschools.net) |
| Evidence- based Strategy: | Research reveals that teacher leadership is practiced in a variety of ways. Sometimes teachers serve in formal leadership positions and, at other times, leadership is demonstrated in informal ways. The key is to provide teachers the opportunity to serve in a leadership capacity. Teachers will be afforded the opportunity to lead through peer observations and facilitation of PLCs. |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy: | Teacher research as leadership; teacher inquiry in collaborative contexts can create new opportunities for teachers to learn and to lead efforts to improve their schools. New models of distributive leadership; these models indicate that teachers can and do perform important leadership tasks inside and outside formal positions of authority. Leadership of teams; self-managed teams promote teacher collaboration; improve teaching and learning, and address problems of school organization |
| | |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Instructional leadership team engages in instructional rounds to identify and progress monitor teacher leadership across grade bands.

2. Administrators participate in PLCs to monitor teacher leadership across personnel.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Proficiency data shows mathematics at all levels is a critical area for improvement. FLCCA students are under performing compared to YoY in: same grade comparison, cohort comparison, district and state. | | | | |
| Measurable Outcome: | The outcome for 2021-2022 is to increase mathematics proficiency by 20%. | | | | |
| Monitoring: | The instructional leadership team will regularly visit classrooms to monitor instruction and provide coaching and support to teachers. Additionally, progress monitoring data will be reviewed with the teachers and instructional leadership team on a weekly basis to monitor progress and achievement. Lastly, teachers will continue to receive professional development to align instructional plans to conceptual mathematical tasks | | | | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Samantha Sheffield (samantha.sheffield@osceolaschools.net) | | | | |
| | Teachers will receive coaching and professional development tied to four strategies with moderate to strong evidence for improving student outcomes: | | | | |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Explicit, systematic instruction Visual representations Schema instruction Metacognitive strategies | | | | |
| | The IRIS Center Peabody College Vanderbilt University Nashville, 2021 | | | | |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Teacher experience and pedagogy differ across the school. It is important to differentiate coaching and development based on current student performance within specific classes and grade levels based on data analysis. | | | | |
| Action Steps to I | mplement | | | | |
| 1. Teachers collab | 1. Teachers collaborate to select and implement rigorous and aligned tasks for students to apply | | | | |

1. Teachers collaborate to select and implement rigorous and aligned tasks for students to mathematics.

2. Teachers implement daily fluency practice to increase automaticity of basic operations.

3. Teachers monitor and provide feedback to students to support learning

4. Teachers and administrators engage in mathematics-focused observations to support high-impact instruction implementation

 Person
 Samantha Sheffield (samantha.sheffield@osceolaschools.net)

 Responsible
 Samantha Sheffield (samantha.sheffield@osceolaschools.net)

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | ELA data for school year 2020-2021 indicates 41% of students are proficient which is below district and state averages. | | | |
| Measurable Outcome: | In 2021-22, FLCCA ELA students will show increased proficiency by 10%. | | | |
| Monitoring: Person | Teachers and leaders will be provided support and direction for evidence-based teaching applying the tenets of Visible Learning and What Works and What Works Best protocols to include: Diagnosis, Intervention, Implementation and Evaluation. Teachers will implement instructional maps aligned to and on-point to current Florida Standards; apply formative assessment data using NWEA Growth Maps to drive instruction; differentiatiate for small group, targeted instruction; and increase rigor in a way that balances students' conceptual understanding, their procedural skill and fluency, and their ability to apply what they know and are able to do to real-world, problem-solving situations. | | | |
| responsible for monitoring outcome: | Samantha Sheffield (samantha.sheffield@osceolaschools.net) | | | |
| Evidence- based Strategy: | Implement Heggerty Phonemic Awareness is designed to provide daily instruction in eight phonological and phonemic awareness skills. Students practice blending, segmenting, and manipulating words, syllables, and phonemes each day. With daily lessons, students are able to build the necessary foundation to become automatic decoders of print. | | | |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy: | Phonemic awareness is the strongest predictor of success in learning to read. It's a better indicator than tests of general intelligence, reading readiness, and listening comprehension. (Stanovich, 1986, 1994) | | | |
| Action Steps | to Implement | | | |
| | | | | |

1. Regularly assess and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction.

2. Consistently implement phonemic awareness lessons in Tier 3 support sessions to close foundational skill gaps.

3. Utilize adaptive, computer-based programs to differentiate and support student growth and monitor progress.

4. Conduct regular data chat to review student outcomes to increase student achievement.

Person

Samantha Sheffield (samantha.sheffield@osceolaschools.net) Responsible

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | The goal of this focus area is to increase the level of proficiency in ELA and Math overall, with an emphasis on increasing proficiency levels of our 5 sub-groups: Black and African American students, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities. The staff and administration at FLCCA will monitor ESSA subgroups throughout the year with fidelity of the MTSS process as there were five subgroups that fell below the 41% threshold during the 2018-2019 school year. Whenever possible, these students will be provided increased instructional and practice time, small group and tiered instruction to help close the achievement gap. | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Measurable Outcome: | ESSA data shows two subgroups significantly below in proficiency: Black and African American students and Students with Disabilities. The outcome for 21-22 is to increase proficiency by at least 15% in both subgroups. | | | | |
| Monitoring: | The leadership team will conduct ongoing data meetings with teachers to determine progress of students within each subgroup. Additionally, progress monitoring data will be reviewed to determine growth within each subgroup to adjust flexible grouping and identify areas of struggle for remediation. | | | | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Thomas Simmering (tsimmering@k12.com) | | | | |
| Evidence- based Strategy: | Implementing MTSS with fidelity will ensure students are identified and provided the supports needed to succeed. Students are identified through assessment and observational data, and a team of stakeholders then determines their plan of action for each student. Many of these students are in need of Tier II and Tier III interventions due to significant skill gaps and proficiency deficits. Small group instruction based upon progress-monitoring data is an evidence-based strategy to improve student achievement. | | | | |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy: | The rationale is grounded in the understanding that knowing what a student can do and how a student learns is at the heart of effective pedgaogy. A Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) is a data-driven, problem-solving framework to improve outcomes for all students. MTSS relies on a continuum of evidence-based practices matched to student needs. PBIS is an form of MTSS centered on social behavior. Stoiber, Karen & Gettinger, Maribeth. (2016). Multi-Tiered Systems of Support and Evidence-Based Practices | | | | |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize MyOn digital library to increase access to reading with student interest in mind.

2. Students are provided with opportunities to make connections to the text and overall learning during lessons.

3. Student voice and choice are integrated into lessons to increase engagement.

Person

Responsible Samantha Sheffield (samantha.sheffield@osceolaschools.net)

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

| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | SEL is beneficial to students by increasing self-awareness, academic achievement, and positive behaviors both in and out of the classroom. The skills learned within an SEL program have been shown to help students better cope with emotional stress, solve problems, and avoid peer pressure to engage in harmful activities. Students who are equipped to deal with problems that affect them on a personal level are then better able to navigate the pressures of adult life |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Measurable Outcome: | Student Pulse Check Survey indicates student motivation at 76% and socialization at 57%. Our goal is to increase motivation to 81% and socialization to 67%. |
| Monitoring: | Embed SEL competencies in classroom instruction and host SEL focused lesson once a week. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Thomas Simmering (tsimmering@k12.com) |
| Evidence- based Strategy: | Embed the 5 SEL skills of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making in classroom instruction and dedicated SEL lessons weekly. |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy: | SEL advances educational equity and excellence through authentic school-family- community partnerships to establish learning environments and experiences that feature trusting and collaborative relationships, rigorous and meaningful curriculum and instruction, and ongoing evaluation. |
| chategy. | Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL), 2021 |
| | |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide consistent and ongoing opportunities for students to practice SEL skills.

- 2. Improve faculty readiness to teach SEL through ongoing professional development.
- 3. Use Grade-Level Team Meetings to Support the Integration of SEL into Instruction.

Person

[no one identified] Responsible

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Since FLCCA is a full time virtual school, student discipline is not common due to the strong expectation for learning coaches to assist students throughout the school day. Teachers implementation positive behavior plans to establish and maintain a positive school environment for students to be successful.

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.

The FLCCA community values the role of our stakeholders in our learning community as they provide a formidable component connected to the welfare and success of our school community. At our school, we strive to develop an environment of inclusivity and belongness that encourages participation by all families and our partnerships. Together, we value the benefits of a virtual education as we have built a school centered upon trust, respect and high expectations. Parents serves as learning coaches who support and extend the implementation of the curriculum by monitoring daily lessons, homework and communications through video conferences, phone calls, and our on-line platforms. Surveys and feedback are solicited in efforts to shape school policy and drive learning success. School Advisory Council meetings offer formal opportunities for parents to provide feedback and shape policy and procedures.

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

FLCCA develops activities to involve parents, families and other community stakeholders in the education of their children and to increase academic success. Our assistant principal will be focused on relationship-building, restorative justice, and maintaining positive morale.

FLCCA also has a Special Programs Manager that helps to support student needs and school-wide PBIS initiatives. Additionally, Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS) process provides additional support for students needing assistance with academics or behaviors.

Additionally, FLCCA has a strong student support team which consists of school leaders, counselor, engagement specialist, and school social worker. This team comes together bi-weekly to discuss school-wide engagement opportunities (virtual social hours, field days, and field trips).

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| 1 | I | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team | \$0.00 |
|---|---|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 2 | 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$80,000.00 |

Osceola - 0153 - Florida Cyber Charter Academy At Osceola - 2021-22 SIP

| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 3374 | | 0153 - Florida Cyber Charter Academy At Osceola | General Fund | | \$80,000.00 |
| Notes: NWEA, Reflex, Dreambox, GoFormative | | | | | | |
| 3 | 3 III.A. Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$75,000.00 | |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 3374 | | 0153 - Florida Cyber Charter Academy At Osceola | General Fund | | \$75,000.00 |
| Notes: NWEA, Mindplay, GoFormative, Nearpod, Zoom, MyOn | | | | | | |
| 4 III.A. Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | | | | \$0.00 | | |
| 5 | 5 III.A. Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | | | \$0.00 | | |
| Total: | | | \$155,000.00 | | | |