Florida Virtual Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Florida Virtual Elementary School

5422 CARRIER DR., Orlando, FL 32819

www.flvsft.com

Demographics

Principal: Sico Sheri   Start Date for this Principal: 8/30/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 was approved by the FL Virtual County School Board on 9/27/2022.

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

Florida Virtual Elementary School

5422 CARRIER DR., Orlando, FL 32819

www.flvsft.com

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)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	43%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the FL Virtual County School Board on 9/27/2022.

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
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
Sico, Sheri	Principal	Oversees the entire operation of the school. Directly supervises assistant principals.
Coston, Carol	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises teachers in kindergarten and 1st grade
Mason, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises teachers in 1st and 2nd grade
Foster, Ryan	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises 3rd grade and intervention teachers
Edwards, Sabrina	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises 4th grade teachers and guidance counselors
Cazanas, Julian	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises special area teachers.
Feacher, Kenyetta	Assistant Principal	Directly supervises 5th grade teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/30/2022, Sico Sheri

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.*
1

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.*

31

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

136

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,760

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

37

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	276	424	466	515	503	576	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2760
Attendance below 90 percent	19	29	20	6	23	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	2	9	1	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	1	5	0	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	30	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	19	113	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	257
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	15	25	27	11	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	2	5	2	19	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	2	14	15	48	23	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
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

Tuesday 8/30/2022

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	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		
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	

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	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	

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	67%	67%	56%				65%	65%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%						55%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						45%	45%	53%
Math Achievement	46%	46%	50%				38%	38%	63%
Math Learning Gains	46%						32%	32%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						26%	26%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	46%	59%				60%	60%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	60%	60%	0%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	67%	0%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	66%	66%	0%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	33%	33%	0%	62%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	40%	40%	0%	64%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2022					
	2019	41%	41%	0%	60%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	59%	59%	0%	53%	6%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

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
2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	50	56	35	33	49	36	45				
ELL	55	63	64	43	52	27	45				
ASN	84	74		81	73		79				
BLK	50	56	41	28	35	27	28				
HSP	68	61	49	44	45	33	56				
MUL	66	63	48	45	50	27	59				
WHT	72	62	46	51	46	34	69				
FRL	56	54	42	33	40	28	42				

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
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				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	38	36	31	26	37	36	31				
ELL	78	85		37	23						
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				

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	45
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	31
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	81%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	78
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	38
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	48
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	51
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	54
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

. The trends that emerge across subgroups:
• In ELA, African Americans have the lowest achievement and learning gains and learning gains in L25
• In math, African American subgroup has the lowest achievement, overall learning gains, and learning gains in the L25
• In science, African American subgroup performs significantly lower than any other subgroup.

In ELA,
• Grade 3rd and 4th dropped in percent passing when compared to PY, while grade 5 maintained percent passing.
• All grade levels had the highest percentage of students passing compared to the state's passing rate.
• In PY, all grade levels increased the number of students passing, and all three grade levels had the highest passing rate compared to the state.

In Math
• In grades 3, 4, and 5, percent passing decreased; however, grade 5 had the highest decrease in the student pass rate.
• All three grade levels fell below the percent passing compared to the state.
• In PY, 4th and 5th-grade levels increased the number of students passing and had the highest passing rate compared to the state.
• In 3rd grade, scored below the state's percent, passing by 6%

In Science
• Students are scoring three and above decreased by 1% compared to the prior year.
• In science, the percent passing was higher by 10% when compared to the state's average

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

The greatest need for improvement
• African American Subgroup in all core subjects this is the only subgroup that has not met the 41% index consecutively for three years
• Math in grades 3-5 fell below the state performance
• Science with a keen focus on Earth, space and Life Science (4th grades standards)

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

State data and being classified as TSI school due to one or more subgroups not meeting the 41% index and declining state performance compared to the prior year's version.

Actions:
• Offering the African American Subgroup services that involve academic support and educating their learning coaches at home. Planned touchpoints for this group and support liaison(s)
• Providing Tutoring/Extended day services with targeted instructional support for science and math instruction with content category focus.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was
In 4th grade ELA, the number of students scoring Achievement Level 3 and 5 increased
In 5th grade ELA, the number of students scoring Achievement Level 3 increased.
In 4th grade Math, the number of students scoring Level 4 increased while students achieving Level 3 and 5 sustained.
Math Learning Gains showed an 11% increase and ELA Learning Gains showed a 6% increase.
The bottom quartile of students showed a 9% increase in ELA Learning Gains.
Overall school grade percentage increased 2%

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

The contributing factors were the correlation between ELA and math curriculum to standards, added intervention staff to work with lower quartile, and targeted PLC groups. We will be increasing tutoring, tired support services, team planning, and cohort planning to improve the data in these areas. We are implementing an extended day program to focus on science and math in 3-5 and ELA in k-3. Team teaching in 4th and 5th grade is being implement and we have hired 2 instructional math coaches.

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

Continued support of students and teachers by:
* An increased number of interventionists
*Extended learning opportunities through Renaissance Learning
*RtI specialists
*Summer curriculum development
*Instructional math coaches

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.

The professional development that will be provided are the following:
• Responding to data immediately and effectively (research-based strategies)
• Visual Thinking Routines during instruction
• Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning
• Student Voice in Math
• Motivating disengaged students
• Leadership Conferences to build pedagogy in BEST standard, culture support, and instructional strategies.

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

Additional Services:

• Instructional coaches
• Tutoring and extended day programs to academic support to various learners
• Continued cycles of professional learning communities
• Continued professional development in teaching and learning
• Continued tiered services provided by interventionist
• Continued instructional support from ESE and ELL and GT department
• MTSS to provide support academically and behaviorally

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.	On the 2022 FSA math assessment, 46% of all students scored proficient, which was a 6% decrease from 2021. 31% of students in the bottom quartile made a learning gain, while 46% of our all our students demonstrated a gain.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	On the 2023 FAST end of year math assessment, 52% of students will score at or above proficient (6% increase).
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	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 collaboration meetings with ESE director and selected administration Bi-weekly review of student data by the administration team PLC focus on math and analysis of new BEST math courses Weekly math planning with teams and math instructional coach Virtual " baseball card" to house individual, class and grade level data monitored by administration Quarterly review of testing data with Evaluation and Measurement Manager Bi-weekly meeting with intervention teachers and designated assistant principal Monthly collaboration meetings with ESE director and selected administration Review of PM 1 and PM 2 student performance to identify learning loss areas to address
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sheri Sico (ssico@flvs.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	1. Targeted small group math instruction with intervention staff 2. Use of math coaches to facilitate data analysis and develop highly trained staff on BEST standards and quality instruction during lessons
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Strategy 1: The percent of students scoring proficient in math has decreased and the students in the lower quartile are not showing adequate yearly progress on state assessments. Strategy 2: Teachers need specific professional development on the new BEST standards and how to provide quality online instruction in the area of math.

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.

Strategy 1:

1. Early identification of students needing additional support through summer screening program

2. Review new student data to identify lowest quartile
3. Assign lowest quartile students targeted class for additional support
4. Facilitate collaboration meetings between selected core and ESE teachers
5. Develop an extended day tutoring program with a math focus
6. Conduct monthly grade level data meetings with RtI specialist
7. Hold 1:1 monthly meetings with assistant principals and core teachers to review an analyze data
8. Plan Data Days in October to analyze PM1 data and develop an instructional plan.

Person Responsible   Sheri Sico (ssico@flvs.net)

Strategy 2:
1. Obtain two math instructional coaches to model lessons and support teacher development
2. Provide professional development on BEST math standards
3. Ensure data driven planning and instruction with cohort content pods
4. PLC with a math focus; Book Study-Math Misconceptions and the 5 Practices in Practice and partnering with the curriculum team to analyze student exam data and new courses and an alignment with BEST standards.
5. Implement instructional rounds to provide teachers the opportunity to observe classroom instruction and share Best Practices for online teaching

Person Responsible   Sheri Sico (ssico@flvs.net)

#2. 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.**	On the 2022 FSA assessment, 68% of students scored at or above proficiency. Learning gains on the FSA assessment increased to 61% for all students and 46% for the lower quartile. However, the data shows there is a need for a continued focus on the lower quartile and overall ELA instruction.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	On the end of the year FAST ELA assessment, 71% of students will score at or above proficiency (3% increase)
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Monthly grade level data meetings to examine i-Ready, fluency and in program assessment data 1:1 monthly meetings with teachers and assistant principal Virtual " baseball card" to house individual, class and grade level data monitored by administration Quarterly review of testing data with Evaluation and Measurement Manager Bi-weekly meeting with intervention teachers and designated assistant principal Monthly collaboration meetings with ESE director and selected administration Bi-weekly review of student data by the administration team Weekly ELA planning with teams and reading coaches Review of PM 1 and PM 2 student performance to identify learning loss areas to address
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sheri Sico (ssico@flvs.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1. The use targeted small group instruction with intervention staff 2. The implementation of standards-based engaging lessons and additional instructional resources
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Strategy 1: Identifying individual student needs and providing targeted small group instruction allows teachers to differentiate and provide scaffolding to close gaps. Strategy 2: Direct instruction in the online environment is limited and students need concise, engaging lessons that are aligned to the BEST standards

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.

Strategy 1:
1. Early identification of students needing additional support through summer screening program
2. Review new student data to identify lowest quartile
3. Assign lowest quartile students targeted class for additional support
4. Facilitate collaboration meetings between selected core and ESE teachers
5. Conduct monthly grade level data meetings with RtI specialist

6. Hold 1:1 monthly meetings with assistant principals and core teachers to review an analyze data
7. Plan Data Days in October to analyze PM1 data and develop an instructional plan
8. Create and implement a tutoring program for identified students to receive additional support in ELA

Person Responsible   Sheri Sico (ssico@flvs.net)

Strategy 2:
1. Provide teachers with professional development on BEST standards
2. PLC opportunity with a focus on examining ELA data, identifying and creating resources
3. Obtain grade level band reading coaches; K-1, 2-3, and 4-5 to support teachers in lesson planning and implementation
4. Complete instructional rounds to allow teachers to observe colleagues and discuss Best Practices
5. Ensure data driven planning and instruction with cohort content pods

Person Responsible   Sheri Sico (ssico@flvs.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	African-American students in grades 3-5 scored at 38%, which is 3% below the Federal Percent of Points Index on the 2022 state assessments.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	African-American students will score at or above the Federal Percent of Points Index (41%), an increase of at least 3%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Identified student data will be collected and monitored during monthly data meetings and 1:1 Classroom Walkthroughs with teachers and assistant principals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sheri Sico (ssico@flvs.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1. Targeted small group instruction and extended learning opportunities for identified students
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Strategy 1: There is a need to ensure these students are receiving additional support and instruction based on not meeting the Federal Percent of Points Index minimum score of 41%.

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.

Strategy 1:
1. Share goal with staff and notify teachers of their students identified as African-American
2. Include a column in virtual data card to identify students and monitor their data
3. Include monthly check-ins with teachers on progress of identified students
4. Facilitate discussions, plans and resources for identified students during Data Days in October
5. Provide additional extended learning opportunities through tutoring sessions

Person Responsible   Sheri Sico (ssico@flvs.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Economically Disadvantaged students scored 40%, which is 1% below the Federal Percent of Points Index on the 2022 state assessment.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Economically Disadvantaged students will meet or exceed the Federal Percent of Points Index of 41% on the end of the year 2023 state assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Identified student data will be collected and monitored during monthly data meetings and 1:1 Classroom Walkthroughs with teachers and assistant principals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sheri Sico (ssico@flvs.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1. Targeted small group instruction and extended learning opportunities for identified students
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Strategy 1: Based on this group of students not meeting the Federal Percent of Points Index minimum score, there is a need to ensure they are receiving additional support and extended learning opportunities.

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.

Strategy 1:
1. Share goal with staff and notify teachers of their students identified as African-American
2. Include a column in virtual data card to identify students and monitor their data
3. Include monthly check-ins with teachers on progress of identified students
4. Facilitate discussions, plans and resources for identified students during Data Days in October
5. Provide additional extended learning opportunities through tutoring sessions

Person Responsible	Sheri Sico (ssico@flvs.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.

Parent and family engagement is a centerpiece of the Florida Virtual Elementary School (FVES). We pride ourselves on modeling this as an integral component to improve 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 FVES student has a learning coach, a parent or an other responsible adult designated by the parents who works with the student 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.

FVES believes in involving parents in all aspects of its Title 1 program. This program will be planned and operated with meaningful consultation amongst parents of participating students, including input towards the Parent and Family Engagement Plan. The School Advisor Council (SAC) has the responsibility of evaluating the various district and school level plans, including the School Improvement Plan (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 are 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 to drive our continued labor towards student academic achievement.

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

FVES prides itself on being the sole online district in the state of Florida. Being virtual, the school relies on stakeholder input primarily through continuous one on one monthly calls and through numerous surveys. While the School Advisory Council is an identified group of valued stakeholders, and the entire parent-body are provided multiple opportunities to impact the school culture and environment via the methods mentioned. 2021-2022 stakeholder feedback indicated a desire for more opportunities for their children to socialize and build relationships amongst other students that reside in their county. As a result, FVES will offer additional face to face meet ups throughout the state of Florida.
1st Meet Up: Friday, September 30, 2022 10am-12pm
2nd Meet Up: Friday, November 18, 2022 10am-12pm
3rd Meet Up: Friday, February 17, 2023 10am-12pm
4th Meet Up: Friday, May 19, 2023 10am-12pm