

Clay County Schools

Clay Virtual Franchise



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Clay Virtual Franchise

2306 KINGSLEY AVE #20, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://cva.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Amanda Stilianou

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 4-12
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)	21%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: I (%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Clay County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Clay Virtual Franchise

2306 KINGSLEY AVE #20, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://cva.oneclay.net>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School 4-12	No	21%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	35%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

Our mission is to offer a virtual education experience which allows students to dream, achieve, and soar anywhere, anytime on any path.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Clay Virtual Academy will provide students a learning path in an innovative online environment where mastery learning is the focus of each child's motivation, organization, and dedication in preparing them to be leaders in a global marketplace.

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
Stilianou, Amanda	Principal	All the responsibilities of the school principal
Garcia, Linda	Assistant Principal	all the responsibilities of the school assistant principal
Weaver, Gayle	Other	Provides instructional support to teachers in best practices of virtual education, ensures compliance to virtual education policies, and assists with data analysis with administration
Gann, William	Teacher, K-12	Science and Math teacher, team lead
Gordon, Keisha	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies teacher, team lead
Senter, Elizabeth (Suzanne)	Teacher, K-12	Elementary teacher, team lead
Smith, Dawn	Teacher, K-12	PE teacher, team lead
White, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	World Language teacher, team lead
Sessions, Natalie	Other	Provides instructional support to teachers in best practices of virtual education, ensures compliance to virtual education policies, and assists with data analysis with administration

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Amanda Stilianou

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

155

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

10

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	2	5	11	8	8	8	7	10	14	17	16	19	30	155	
Attendance below 90 percent	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		
Course failure in ELA	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		
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	2	6	2	16	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	

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	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/15/2022

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	15	29	31	34	19	28	36	33	55	31	38	48	64	461
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	3	9	3	5	9	7	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	2	11	5	8	7	7	12	11	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:

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	1	2	1	1	4	2	2	6	4	23

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	15	29	31	34	19	28	36	33	55	31	38	48	64	461
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	3	9	3	5	9	7	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	2	11	5	8	7	7	12	11	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:

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	1	2	1	1	4	2	2	6	4	23

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	68%	54%	55%				81%	57%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						72%	53%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						92%	53%	54%
Math Achievement	52%	34%	42%				67%	52%	62%
Math Learning Gains	55%						53%	49%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						70%	46%	52%
Science Achievement	55%	55%	54%				82%	54%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	50%	59%				79%	77%	78%

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
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	64%	-64%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	74%	59%	15%	52%	22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	88%	62%	26%	56%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	70%	-70%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	79%	63%	16%	54%	25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	49%	-49%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	69%	64%	5%	48%	21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	95%	72%	23%	67%	28%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	81%	80%	1%	71%	10%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	89%	80%	9%	70%	19%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	79%	65%	14%	61%	18%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	47%	64%	-17%	57%	-10%

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	46	37	42	44	54	30	31	68		85	36
BLK	63	59		32	43		45	64		100	42
HSP	65	52		64	63		50	64		79	27
MUL	70			40							
WHT	70	59	43	57	55	31	60	73		96	48
FRL	67	54		41	44		44	71		94	47
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	40	37	25	37	38	29	48	36			
BLK	55	43	35	29	22	27	38	77	46		
HSP	74	64	62	60	31	14	67	70			
MUL	73	57		50	33		58				
WHT	66	49	36	57	35	35	69	70	53		
FRL	64	48	42	47	33	20	59	85	30		
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	81	74		74	57		80	79	50	77	54
FRL	79	73		63	54						

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	621
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	87%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	55
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	59
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	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Secondary level students did at or better in most areas than their brick and mortar peers while elementary level students struggled to show proficiency on math and reading skills. ELA grades 3-10 outperformed both the state and district averages and were in the top 5 among FLVS franchises in 3rd, 4th and 9th grade ELA. Black, White, Hispanic, and Multiracial students performed at similar levels. Students with disabilities underperform their peers.

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

Math proficiency and math learning gains in grades 3-8 show a need for growth and improvement, with grades 3-5 needing the most. Civics at the 7th and 8th grade level also experienced a drop and is an area of concern, especially considering that the same group of students performed well on reading and math assessments. Initial baseline testing in i-ready math for grades K-5 show 56% of students working one grade level below, 12% two grade levels below and 2% working three or more grade levels below in math. 29% of students are working at or above grade level. PM 1 FAST testing confirms the math skill weaknesses with only 17% of students scoring at or above proficient in grades 3-8 math FAST (Given Fall 2022).

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

An area of concern is the curriculum and the role of the learning coach helping students at home by teaching an algorithm instead of conceptual development in math. New actions include weekly in person lessons with the teacher that will focus on conceptual math development, added spiral review with additional practice problems, and our math teachers working with our district math specialists to identify additional resources and practice for students that targets the gaps in curriculum.

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

We saw growth in the area of US History and scored in the top of our district on the EOC. We also saw improvements in Bio EOC. We also scored in the top 3 in our district for ELA in 4th, 7th, 9th and 10th grade. We improved graduation rate.

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

Teachers provided targeted practice for EOCs in US History and Biology. For reading, students were engaged in using lexia at the elementary levels and updates to the FLVS curriculum in ELA provided additional focus on the new BEST standards.

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

Students will continue to use Lexia and teachers will use more of the teacher lessons from the platform to drive small group 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.

Elementary teachers will attend professional development on Lexia and I-ready to be able to more effectively use these tools. EOC teachers will work in PLC and will focus on identifying high impact strategies for EOC courses for spiral review and tracking student learning progress towards mastery of standards. Math teachers will work with district math specialists to identify high impact supplemental materials and strategies that work in a virtual setting and improve their understanding of the new BEST math standards and how to use the strategies given in the state's Big M resource book.

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

PLCs are staggered so that administration can attend as many as possible. Connections with district curriculum specialists for crosswalk discussions of the FLVS curriculum with other district curriculum resources to allow our teachers to have a deeper resource and strategy toolkit available to help students. Added a supplemental position to serve as the team lead for the academic success team. In coordination with guidance, the academic success team will monitor student pacing and grades more closely and be able to provide support to students as needed.

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 Math**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Building foundational math skills in grades K-8 are critical to successful mastery of more complex mathematics at the high school level. Data shows that 48% CVA students are not meeting proficiency of the standards and 45% are also not making learning gains to close the gaps. With close to half of all math students at risk in math, this is an important area of focus. On the PM 1 Math FAST, 31.7% of students in grades k-8 were on or above benchmarks in math.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

55% of students in grades K-8 in math be proficient on end of year state assessments given in May 2023 (PM 3 FAST Math).

Monitoring:

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

Student progress will be monitored on PM 1 and PM2 of the state assessment, through teacher tracking of student mastery of content as demonstrated on tests and quizzes and the discussion based assessments and through i-ready math and local district assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Tutoring one-to-one and in small group will be used to provide students with additional practice with modeling and guided practice with the teacher via zoom live lessons and weekly in-person lessons (K-5 only).

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Targeted academic tutoring has shown to have a high effect size when used to provide remediation to students during the learning cycle. Teachers will use data from student coursework progress to align tutoring sessions to meet student learning needs. This will also provide opportunities for students to receive feedback during the learning process and not just when they submit assignments for grading.

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.

K-5 teachers will identify one day a week for in-person math lessons and these lessons will use district curriculum resources to supplement the FLVS curriculum. Teachers will attend a PD with district math curriculum specialists to learn more about the resources available.

Person Responsible Linda Garcia (linda.garcia@myoneclay.net)

Secondary Math PLCs will analyze data weekly and work together to identify curriculum resources and strategies that can be used to help struggling math students.

Person Responsible Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Civics data shows that while our 7th and 8th grade students have shown strong proficiency in reading and math, in the area of Civics as shown on the EOC student progress slipped this past year with a 17% drop. Having a strong foundation in civics allows students to meet more challenging content confidently and prepares our students to be functioning citizens as they head into young adulthood.

Measurable Outcome:

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

71% or more of students will meet proficiency on the end of year assessment (EOC) in Civics when given in May 2023.

Monitoring:

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

Student progress will be monitored through their coursework progress on tests/quizzes and during Discussion Based Assessments. Additionally, during discussion based assessments the teacher will provide specific feedback related to how these topics may be presented on the EOC and provide spiral review.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Garcia (linda.garcia@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Targeted academic tutoring 1-1 or in small groups through zoom live lessons and over the phone during discussion based assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Targeted academic tutoring 1-1 or in small groups is proven to have a high size effect. Given the online nature of our school, this strategy will allow teachers to schedule tutoring sessions around the needs of groups of students or individuals. Teachers will be able to use resources from our district curriculum guides as well as FLVS.

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.

PLCs for Social Studies teachers allow teachers to collaborate on best practices and strategies for working/tutoring in small groups or one to one. They will be able to analyze test items and plan tutoring lessons that align to EOC benchmarks.

Person Responsible

Linda Garcia (linda.garcia@myoneclay.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to attendance**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Attendance at the virtual school is determined by students submitting work weekly and remaining on pace. Last year, CVA students averaged 75% weekly attendance (submitted at least one assignment per class weekly).

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

80% of students will submit work weekly and be on pace.

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

Through reports available in teacher accounts with FLVS, students' weekly work submissions and pace can be tracked.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

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

For this strategy, teachers will be very specific on what attendance to virtual school looks like and teachers will analyze student data twice a week and students who are not submitting work will be contacted and support offered. Specific pacing guides with checkpoints are used in each class to specify exactly what work should be done each week. Teachers have engaging and easy to use welcome pages that explain expectations. Teachers have welcome calls with students and parents in the first 14 days of class to set clear expectations.

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

Setting clear and specific behavior guidelines and expectations is a proven strategy to improve student behavior outcomes and improve school culture.

selecting this strategy.

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.

Establish an academic success team and student tracking system for weekly progress monitoring for students, procedures for referring a student to the success team, and action steps members will take. The team will analyze data weekly.

Person Responsible Amanda Stilianou (amanda.stilianou@myoneclay.net)

#4. 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.

Based on PM 1 of FAST reading given in September 2022, 58.5% of students in grades K-10 were performing at or above benchmarks. This means that over 40% of students are not performing on level. Literacy skills are critical to the academic success of students, especially in our virtual platform where reading the content independently is how the majority of content is delivered to the student.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the year PM 3 FAST Reading assessment, 68% of students will be reading on or above benchmark in grades K-10.

Monitoring:

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

Progress on this goal will be monitored by the state assessment system (PM 2), lexia/Achieve progress monitoring, and literacy assessments given in the students' ELA classes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Garcia (linda.garcia@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Small group and one to one instruction in the components of literacy will be provided to students who are identified as needing intervention. Teachers will use Lexia, Achieve 3000, Heggerty, and PALS as curriculum resources for the small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Small group and one to one direction instruction in the literacy skills is a proven strategy with a high impact effect on student growth. This strategy was selected because it is a strategy that is conducive to virtual instruction and has the highest impact on student reading growth.

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.

Teachers in grades k-5 will attend district training on Lexia and other reading supplemental programs to become more proficient in using the literacy instructional components of these programs and how to best implement instruction and monitor student literacy growth. During PLCs, K-5 teachers will analyze literacy assessments each quarter to identify students who need additional support.

Person Responsible

Linda Garcia (linda.garcia@myoneclay.net)

ELA teachers in grades 6-10 will meet weekly in PLCs to review student progress and discuss/plan best practices for improving student literacy skills. Teachers will plan live lessons and supports for students

who need additional instruction to improve reading skills. Teachers will use student progress monitoring from discussion based assessments to determine student needs for live lessons or tutoring sessions.

Person Responsible Linda Garcia (linda.garcia@myoneclay.net)

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.

We focus on positive interactions and feedback between teachers and students/families. Each student and parent participates in an individualized and personalized welcome call to start each course. This provides an opportunity for the teacher and family to get to know each other, explain the course and expectations and establish a positive relationship. Teachers hold live lesson sessions that help teachers and students connect in a more personal manner and to address some of the more challenging content. Teachers also schedule individual sessions with students based on the grade level and/or student needs. Additionally, each student participates in regularly scheduled discussion based assessments throughout the course. These voice to voice discussions with their teachers allows students to show what they've learned and get specific help as needed. Teachers provide positive feedback and use these moments to further develop their positive relationships with their students. All feedback on graded assignments must be given in an encouraging and positive tone and this is tracked and monitored by the FLVS quality assurance team. Teachers track student progress twice a week and target students who are not meeting high expectations for additional support and strategies to help them be successful and engaged in their learning. Students who fall behind or struggle are referred to the academic success team. A team member will then reach out to the student and develop a support plan. Building a positive and supportive relationship with the academic support team member is a primary goal of this interaction and is geared toward engaging the student in their learning, helping them develop skills for success, and reaching their academic and social/emotional goals.

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

Teachers- direct contact with students and parents to promote high academic expectations and support when needed to meet those and to develop positive relationships with students and their families.

ESE Support Facilitators- direct contact with students with disabilities and their families to provide academic and behavior supports and/or lessons to help the students be successful in their classes and build positive work habits and skills for future success. They work to ensure students have the tools and supports necessary to have positive experiences with virtual learning.

Parents- parents/guardians serve as "learning coaches" in the virtual learning environment. They play a critical role in promoting a positive culture for our school by providing a quality learning space in their homes for their student to learn in, having high expectations for students to complete assignments with fidelity, help students create a structure and organizational system for time management to be successful, and by communicating with the student's teachers to provide the support needed for student success

Guidance counselor- provide academic counseling to students/families to pick the best courses for that student and to provide support to students/families as needed for emotional/mental health.

School Administration- set high expectations for the academic rigor and integrity of our virtual learning program and the positive relationship building expected of teachers, monitor communicators between teachers and students to ensure feedback is positive and supportive

Administrative Office Staff- provide a welcoming and helpful environment to assist students and their families in any interactions and to meet the needs of students and their families in a timely and professional manner.