

Florida Virtual School

Florida Virtual Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Florida Virtual Elementary School

5422 CARRIER DR., Orlando, FL 32819

www.flvsft.com

Demographics

Principal: Sico Sheri

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
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. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the FL Virtual 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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Florida Virtual Elementary School

5422 CARRIER DR., Orlando, FL 32819

www.flvsft.com

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">41%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">61%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the FL Virtual 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.

FLVS Full Time Elementary schools mission is to deliver high-quality digital learning on a robust online platform to achieve content mastery for student success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to lead online education worldwide with transformative digital solutions – personalized to every student.

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
Rummler, Marc	Principal	Oversee the entire operation of the school. Directly supervises assistant principals.
Sico, Sheri	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises guidance counselors and intervention teachers.
Foster, Ryan	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises 2nd and 3rd grade teachers.
Cazanas, Julian	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises teachers in Special Areas: Computer science, Physical Education, Art and Spanish
Edwards, Sabrina	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises teachers in grades 4 and 5
Coston, Carol	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises teachers in kindergarten and 1st grades
Mason, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises teachers in grades 1 and 2.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/12/2016, Sico Sheri

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.*

2

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

173

Total number of students enrolled at the school

4,880

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

20

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

40

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	707	802	745	797	833	996	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4880
Attendance below 90 percent	404	259	284	237	292	252	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1728
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	5	4	2	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	4	3	2	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	30	28	28	20	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152

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	5	5	3	5	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	8	14	24	26	26	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/22/2021

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	981	710	768	828	900	932	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5119
Attendance below 90 percent	108	59	57	50	41	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	366
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	1	0	0	1	4	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	981	710	768	828	900	932	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5119
Attendance below 90 percent	108	59	57	50	41	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	366
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	1	0	0	1	4	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				65%	65%	57%	64%		56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	55%	58%	53%		55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	45%	53%	37%		48%
Math Achievement				38%	38%	63%	51%		62%
Math Learning Gains				32%	32%	62%	40%		59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				26%	26%	51%	28%		47%
Science Achievement				60%	60%	53%	58%		55%

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	60%	60%	0%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	67%	0%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	66%	66%	0%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	33%	33%	0%	62%	-29%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	40%	0%	64%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	41%	0%	60%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	59%	59%	0%	53%	6%
Cohort Comparison						

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 tool used to compile the data below was I-Ready. I-Ready was used to monitor students in grades 1-5 in ELA, and grades 2-5 in Math.

In regard to courses without an official progress monitoring tool, course module exam data will be reviewed and monitored to gauge proficiency and areas of weakness including 5th grade Science.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		80%	83%
	Economically Disadvantaged		74%	76%
	Students With Disabilities		66%	60%
	English Language Learners		92%	69%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66%	78%	84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	57%	66%	73%
	Students With Disabilities	48%	56%	69%
	English Language Learners	47%	58%	73%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46%	57%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41%	44%	62%
	Students With Disabilities	32%	48%	69%
	English Language Learners	39%	44%	67%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	79%	87%	91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	76%	86%	88%
	Students With Disabilities	66%	69%	83%
	English Language Learners	67%	79%	77%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	37%	55%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	46%	66%
	Students With Disabilities	22%	57%	67%
	English Language Learners	33%	50%	68%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	64%	77%	81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	55%	68%	74%
	Students With Disabilities	44%	68%	64%
	English Language Learners	45%	58%	52%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43%	62%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%	50%	66%
	Students With Disabilities	32%	49%	60%
	English Language Learners	45%	62%	60%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	64%	75%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	55%	67%	68%
	Students With Disabilities	36%	45%	49%
	English Language Learners	52%	60%	70%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	49%	62%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41%	54%	65%
	Students With Disabilities	22%	31%	39%
	English Language Learners	37%	57%	60%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	92%	80%	94%
	Economically Disadvantaged	89%	73%	93%
	Students With Disabilities	86%	68%	88%
	English Language Learners	100%	71%	88%

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	50	40	38	34	34	42	38				
ELL	52	57		44	43		58				
ASN	83			82			74				
BLK	59	58	20	33	21	19	36				
HSP	70	54	45	46	33	41	59				
MUL	64	50	42	53	39	29	55				
WHT	76	56	31	56	38	28	67				
FRL	62	56	45	39	34	29	49				
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
SWD	38	36	31	26	37	36	31				
ELL	78	85		37	23						

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
BLK	56	52	50	31	31	21	36				
HSP	72	62	50	38	31	29	63				
MUL	67	50		35	25						
WHT	63	53	40	40	35	25	62				
FRL	60	57	53	32	35	25	47				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	48	44	41	45	43	17	47				
ELL	45	38		29	33						
ASN	75	50		75	50		50				
BLK	49	44	45	36	30	28	40				
HSP	70	59	31	47	38	28	57				
MUL	66	48	38	47	27	18	69				
WHT	64	52	37	54	44	29	60				
FRL	57	51	36	40	32	21	47				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	344
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	68%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	51
---	----

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	47
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	50
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

FSA and iReady data across grade levels shows a need for a continued focus on math. While proficiency has increased in ELA and math, the data shows our students with disabilities (SWD) and our bottom quartile are not meeting proficiency standards at the same rate as other students or making adequate yearly progress.

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

According to the 2021 FSA math assessment, 31% of the bottom quartile students made a learning gain. This was a 5% gain from 2019, but it still an area that need improvement.

For the FSA ELA assessment, 37% of the bottom quartile made a learning gain. This was the only area that declined from 2019, showing an 8% decrease.

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

Online learning environment allows for larger class sizes, which limits the time and opportunities for teachers to conduct targeted intervention with smaller groups of students.

Nearly 90% of K-5 instructional staff was new to online teaching and had to learn FLVS programs and platforms.

For the 2021-22 school year, additional interventions instructors will be hired to deliver targeted instruction to specific students in the bottom quartile. In addition, literacy specialists will support individual grade levels and provide professional development on meeting the needs of struggling students in the virtual setting.

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

FLVS FT Elementary improved in all areas on FSA, except the learning gains of the bottom quartile in ELA.

ELA: Every race/ethnicity showed an increase, except for Hispanic and Black but the decreases were minimal. The FRL subgroup also increased and is almost 20% higher than the state and the SWD subgroup increased by 16%, but is still 20% lower than the school average.

Math: Every subgroup showed a gain from 2019 to 2021. SWD subgroup increased by almost 8%, but is still almost 17% lower than the school average.

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

Focus on student participation/engagement during live lessons, use of spiral reviews; increased number of content area experts on each grade level

- Weekly tutoring in Reading, Writing, and Math
- Specific iReady lessons assigned to students
- Study guides used with lessons
- Clubs focusing on lessons taught in class, such as; Cooking Club (fractions) and Book Club (Reading strategies)
- iReady minutes monitored and incentives provided
- Communicating with parents monthly and providing resources for areas of growth with fluency packets
- New weekly progress reports sent to parents every Friday
- Teachers recorded themselves reading so students always had access to books
- Testing students individually to pinpoint what they specifically needed
- Provide on demand help sites for students to access
- Using a flipped classroom model for math

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

Grade level instruction and materials will continue to be used during whole group class time. Additional direct small group instruction will need to be provided for the bottom quartile students by highly qualified intervention teachers.

Data will be collected and reviewed monthly to identify needs and gaps.

ESE and intervention teachers will participate in weekly grade level planning meetings. Teachers will need to continue to refine the curriculum.

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.

Two books will be used during bi-weekly PLCs, Math Misconceptions and The 5 Practices in Practice. The strategies learned in these books will be implemented in the K-5 classrooms and then data will be collected and shared during bi-weekly meetings.

Best practices for students in the online setting will be shared during the bi-weekly School House meetings.

Teachers will be trained on data analysis.

Teachers will be provided opportunities to observe other teachers conduct live lessons.

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

New teachers will be placed in a cohort group to receive additional training and support.

Teachers will be provided with, and encouraged to seek out, additional opportunities for professional development with a focus on accelerating learning of low performing students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

On the 2021 FSA Math assessment, 52% of students were scored proficient and 31% of students in the bottom quartile made a learning gain. 48% of 3rd grade students, 54% of 4th grade students, 55% of 5th grade students and 36% of SWD (Students with Disabilities) scored proficient on the 2021 FSA Math assessment. (Cognia Standards: 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.9, 1.10, 2.2, 2.5, 2.6, 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5 & 3.6)

Measurable Outcome:

On the 2022 FSA Math assessment, 40% of the bottom quartile of students will make a learning gain (9% increase), and 40% of SWD will score at or above proficient (4% increase).

Monitoring:

- Monthly individual classroom walkthrough data review meetings with teacher and assistant principal
- Monthly grade level data meetings with assistant principal
- Bi-weekly meeting with intervention teachers and designated assistant principal
- Monthly meetings with designated assistant principal and ESE department personnel to review data
- Weekly review of student data by entire administration team
- Frequent collaboration with district Evaluation & Measurement Manager for in-depth data analysis
- Bi-weekly PLCs focusing specifically on math

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Targeted small group instruction with intervention staff (Cognia Standards: 2.1, 2.3, 2.7, 2.9, 2.10, 2.11)
 2. Implementation of additional resources to ensure mastery of math standards (Cognia Standards: 2.9, 3.5 & 3.6)
 3. Development of a highly-trained staff (Cognia Standards: 1.1, 1.6, 1.9, 1.10, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2 & 3.3)
- Strategy 1: The learning gains of our ESE and bottom quartile students are low and demonstrate a lack of adequate yearly progress being made.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Strategy 2: Students working in an environment where direct instruction time is limited, require relevant and engaging resources in order to master essential skills. Additionally, there is a need for resources to accurately measure students' independent levels.

Strategy 3: Teachers need to be provided with professional development in order to hone their craft and provide quality instruction in the area of math. Students must be provided with highly trained teachers to ensure delivery of instruction rises to the level students need to be successful.

Action Steps to Implement

Strategy 1:

1. Implement a Strong Start summer program to screen new students to obtain early and accurate data.
2. Collaborate with the Evaluation & Measurement team to accurately identify the bottom quartile of students.
3. Assign an administrator to oversee all intervention teachers and work directly with the ESE personnel.

4. Obtain additional intervention teachers to provide direct instruction to bottom quartile of students.
5. Collaborate with ESE personnel to ensure students are receiving appropriate and adequate academic instruction.
6. Develop progress monitoring tools to assess and track students.
7. Ensure 1:1 teacher-assistant principal monthly classroom walk-through meetings specifically analyze data of these students.
8. Conduct monthly grade level data meetings.

Person Responsible Sheri Sico (ssico@flvs.net)

Strategy 2:

1. Provide individual workbooks for students that align to the FL Standards and provide additional practice.
2. Provide tutoring to all academically at-risk students.
3. Assign specific iReady math lessons to academically at-risk students.
4. Implement practice/mock FSA assessments to students.
5. Conduct evening parent information sessions on math strategies.

Person Responsible Sabrina Edwards (saedwards@flvs.net)

Strategy 3:

1. Provide instructional staff the evidenced-based resources: Math Misconceptions and The 5 Practices in Practice.
2. Conduct bi-weekly PLCs focusing on the math resources.
3. Provide opportunity for select teachers, as selected by their supervisor, to share best practices in math instruction during bi-weekly School House meetings.
4. Train teachers on data analysis during grade level meetings by assistant principals.
5. Ensure 1:1 teacher-assistant principal monthly classroom walk-through meetings specifically analyze data of these students.
6. Conduct Data Days in October with 3rd - 5th grade teachers to analyze FSA results and develop lesson plans to address areas needing improvement.
7. Implement Instructional Rounds to give all teachers the opportunity to observe and discuss live lessons with peers.

Person Responsible Ryan Foster (rfoster@flvs.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the 2021 FSA ELA assessment, 37% of the students in the bottom quartile made a learning gain and 51% of SWD (Students with Disabilities) scored at proficient or above. (Cognia Standards: 1.1, 1.3, 1.10, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.9, 2.11, 2.12, 3.1, 3.2, 3.5 & 3.6)
Measurable Outcome:	On the 2022 FSA Reading assessment, 47% of students in the bottom quartile will make a learning gain (10% increase), and 55% of SWD will score at or above proficient (4% increase).
Monitoring:	Monthly individual classroom walkthrough data review meetings with teacher and assistant principal Monthly grade level data meetings with assistant principal Bi-weekly meeting with intervention teachers and designated assistant principal Weekly review of student data by entire administration team Frequent collaboration with district Evaluation & Measurement Manager for in-depth data analysis
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marc Rummler (mrummler@flvs.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Targeted small group instruction with intervention staff (Cognia Standards: 2.1, 2.3, 2.7, 2.9, 2.10, 2.11) 2. The implementation of additional resources to ensure mastery of reading standards. (Cognia Standards: 2.9, 3.5 & 3.6)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategy 1: The learning gains for the bottom quartile decreased 8%, and there is a 21% difference in proficiency for SWD and overall proficiency. Strategy 2: Students working in an environment where direct instruction time is limited, require relevant and engaging resources in order to master essential skills.

Action Steps to Implement

- Strategy 1:
1. Implement a Strong Start summer program to screen new students to obtain early and accurate data.
 2. Collaborate with the Evaluation & Measurement team to accurately identify the bottom quartile of students.
 3. Assign an administrator to oversee all intervention teachers and work directly with the ESE personnel.
 4. Obtain additional intervention teachers to provide direct instruction to bottom quartile of students.
 5. Collaborate with ESE personnel to ensure students are receiving appropriate and adequate academic instruction.
 6. Develop progress monitoring tools to assess and track students.
 7. Ensure 1:1 teacher-assistant principal monthly classroom walk-through meetings specifically analyze data of these students.
 8. Conduct Data Days in October with 3rd - 5th grade teachers to analyze FSA results and develop lesson plans to address areas needing improvement.
 9. Conduct monthly grade level data meetings.

Person Responsible Sheri Sico (ssico@flvs.net)

- Strategy 2:
1. Provide individual workbooks for students that align to the FL Standards and provide additional practice.

2. Provide tutoring to all academically at-risk students.
3. Assign specific iReady reading lessons to academically at-risk students.
4. Implement practice/mock FSA assessments to students.
5. Create independent reading incentive program for students.
6. Provide targeted fluency resources for families to build fluency and comprehension.
7. Family Literacy Nights to provide students and families with strategies to help their children at home.

Person Responsible Ryan Foster (rfoster@flvs.net)

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.

FLVS Full Time Elementary is not part of the SafeSchholsforAlex.org data base.

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.

Parent and family engagement is a centerpiece of the FLVS FT Elementary School model and is integral to improving student academic achievement. Parent and family engagement is also underscored in the Learning Coach Agreement which every parent must sign when enrolling their child. Each FLVS FT student has a Learning coach, a parent or other responsible adult designated by the parents to who works with him or her in person, under the guidance of a Florida-certified professional teacher. Whether a parent's role is a Learning Coach, or as someone providing oversight to the Learning Coach, all parents and guardians are intimately familiar with their child's progress on a day-to-day basis. The Learning Coaches are directly involved with students' day-to-day learning.

FLVS FT Elementary believes in involving parents in all aspects of its Title 1 programs. These programs will be planned and operated with meaningful consultation with parents of participating children, including the school-parent compact. The SAC has the responsibility of evaluating the various district and school level plans, including the SIP. More than 50% of the members of the SAC are parent (non-employee) representatives. All parents are given the opportunity to review the plan and offer their input prior to approval.

Parents were also provided with a Parent Satisfaction Survey at the end to the school year requesting their input regarding curriculum, parent involvement activities, school communication, the Leader in Me program and student achievement. The survey data and feedback is used drive our continued use of Leader in Me where we develop leadership skills in each child.
 (Cognia Standards: 1.8, 2.3, 2.4, 3.6, & 3.7)

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

Being virtual, the school relies on stakeholder input primarily through surveys. While the School Advisory Council is an identified group of valued stakeholders, the entire parent-body are provided multiple opportunities to impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder feedback from a recent survey indicated a desire for more opportunities for their children to meet other students that resided near them. This led to the school scheduling students by regions for the 2021-22 school year.

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
Total:			\$0.00