

Leon County Schools

Leon County Virtual School Franchise



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Leon County Virtual School Franchise

283 TROJAN TRAIL, Tallahassee, FL 32311

<http://www.leongoesvirtual.net>

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Riccardo

Start Date for this Principal: 12/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	11%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: I (%) 2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (75%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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 Leon 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Leon County Virtual School Franchise

283 TROJAN TRAIL, Tallahassee, FL 32311

<http://www.leongoesvirtual.net>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 6-12</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">11%</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;">54%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	I		A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon 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.

Leon County Virtual School's mission is to foster a virtual learning environment that meets the needs of the individual family while upholding academic integrity and promoting instructional innovation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mirrors Leon County Schools vision statement
 Leon County Virtual School will be an engaging, safe, and respectful learning environment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bradley, Nikki	Assistant Principal	Monitors all aspects of instruction.
Ricardo, Jennifer	Principal	Monitor leadership and instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 12/1/2021, Jennifer Riccardo

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

11

Total number of students enrolled at the school

196

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

0

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

0

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	4	10	6	12	7	6	10	11	16	21	19	17	27	166
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	7	0	11
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

Friday 9/16/2022

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	46	36	47	57	27	47	48	51	49	44	35	42	27	556
Attendance below 90 percent	4	1	4	4	4	2	4	2	1	6	3	5	1	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	9	7	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	5	7	5	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	8	5	13	12	12	12	13	9	4	92
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	8	10	18	16	16	10	7	7	4	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	4	8	5	13	12	12	12	13	9	4	92

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	3	2	5	9	10	0	34

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	3	2	2	4	1	1	2	2	1	5	6	3	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4	2	2	16

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	46	36	47	57	27	47	48	51	49	44	35	42	27	556
Attendance below 90 percent	4	1	4	4	4	2	4	2	1	6	3	5	1	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	9	7	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	5	7	5	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	8	5	13	12	12	12	13	9	4	92
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	8	10	18	16	16	10	7	7	4	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	4	8	5	13	12	12	12	13	9	4	92

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	3	2	5	9	10	0	34

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	3	2	2	4	1	1	2	2	1	5	6	3	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4	2	2	16

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement		55%	51%				91%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains							75%	52%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								40%	42%
Math Achievement		36%	38%				76%	56%	51%
Math Learning Gains							71%	47%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								47%	45%
Science Achievement		47%	40%				90%	67%	68%
Social Studies Achievement		46%	48%					82%	73%

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
06	2022					
	2019	0%	54%	-54%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	59%	-59%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	45%	-45%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	44%	-44%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	82%	70%	12%	67%	15%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	75%	-75%	71%	-71%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	81%	-81%	70%	-70%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	69%	-69%	61%	-61%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	67%	-67%	57%	-57%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	12	27		5	27						
ASN	90										
BLK	47	50	36	21	34		30	62			
HSP	72	54		63	38						
MUL	80			50							
WHT	72	47		45	56		58	73		100	70

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
BLK	46	50		27	20						
HSP	73										
WHT	85	51		72	53		84	93		100	62

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
WHT	88	79		90						100	50

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
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	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	513
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	61%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Proficiency in Math and ELA was down compared to previous years but Learning Gains in ELA were up. Proficiency was down across the board for ELA, Math and Science. Learning Gains and gains within the lowest 25%ile were decreased in ELA. Learning Gains in Math were down however, gains for the lowest 25%ile were up in Math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Proficiency in all areas: ELA, Math and Science

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

Learning loss sustained due to the pandemic is one factor contributing to this need for improvement. In addition, students enrolled in LCVS for the 21-22 school year were first time students in virtual school and thus the format created some barriers to learning. Many students chose to return to brick and mortar during the school year or by the end of the year.

Actions: Students need to be screened to determine if virtual learning is the most appropriate learning environment. Monthly data chats will also be implemented.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math gains for the lowest 25%ile showed the greatest improvement.

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

Implementation of Moby Max for tracking students mastery on Math standards.

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

Progress monitoring data will need to be analyzed regularly in order to drive instructional decisions. Students who are meeting academic targets will need to be exposed to high cognitive demand tasks in order to synthesize new information and move forward. Students needing Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions will regularly receive their interventions using evidence based instruction.

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.

We will be introducing the new FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment in grades 3-5. In an effort to meet those professional development needs we have set monthly meetings to discuss instructional needs, to analyze progress monitoring data, and to provide professional development support. During those monthly meetings, instructional needs may arise that require additional professional development and we will work in collaboration with our district curriculum development department to offer those opportunities.

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

Students in grades K-3, who are not meeting grade level expectations, will have the opportunity to participate in "beyond the bell" tutoring after school during the first semester. Teachers will offer one-on-one tutoring sessions for student that are struggling. High school students will also have "test prep" sessions available to attend.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Proficiency was down across the board for ELA and Math. Learning Gains and gains within the lowest 25%ile were decreased in ELA. Learning Gains in Math were down however, gains for the lowest 25%ile were up in Math.

Measurable Outcome:
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA Proficiency will increase from 63 to 70%

Monitoring:
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

FAST Progress Monitoring
 Monthly Data Chats

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nikki Bradley (bradley@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

K-8 Tier 3 Reading Interventions Lexia Core5 and Power Up
 9-12 LCS Reading Tool Kit
 ACT/SAT Bootcamp

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

District purchased initiative

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Proficiency was down across the board for ELA and Math. Learning Gains and gains within the lowest 25%ile were decreased in ELA. Learning Gains in Math were down however, gains for the lowest 25%ile were up in Math.

Measurable Outcome:
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Math Proficiency will increase from 41 to 50%

Monitoring:
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

FAST Progress Monitoring
 Monthly Data Chats

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nikki Bradley (bradley@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

iReady Grades K-5
 Moby Max Grades 6-8
 One-on-One Tutoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

District purchased initiative

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

N/A

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

LCVS is an all inclusive school that includes all stakeholders in the decision making (parents, students, teachers, administrators). By affording everyone to have a voice in the decision making it creates a positive learning environment.

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

Jennifer Ricardo - Principal Workplace Culture Coordinator
Nikki Bradley - Assistant Principal Master of Communication
ALL Teachers
ALL Parents
ALL Students