

Volusia County Schools

Volusia Online Learning Flvs (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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Volusia Online Learning Flvs (Franchise)

250 ENTERPRISE RD, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://volusiaonlinelearning.com/site/>

Demographics

Principal: Anthony Serianni A

Start Date for this Principal: 8/22/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	14%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Volusia 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Volusia Online Learning Flvs (Franchise)

250 ENTERPRISE RD, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://volusiaonlinelearning.com/site/>

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 KG-12	No	14%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

Volusia Online Learning offers rigorous courses taught by highly qualified local teachers utilizing personalized learning experiences while cultivating positive relationships that will empower students to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide quality, student-centered online educational opportunities that develop productive 21st-century citizens using challenging and innovative learning strategies.

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
Shaw, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Elementary Division
Mollo, Kristin	Assistant Principal	Secondary Division and ESE
Chapple, Christa	Other	Curriculum Specialist: Online curriculum and instruction specialist, secondary level.
Sierra, Ida	Teacher, K-12	Testing Coordinator
Larson, Chanda		Manages Focus
Chalfant, Amy		Elementary Resource Teacher responsible for FLVS VSA assignment and teacher professional development
Serianni, Anthony	Principal	Oversees full VOL operations.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/22/2022, Anthony Serianni A

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

102

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,050

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

23

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

3

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	29	47	60	58	58	67	26	23	17	14	15	14	0	428
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	5	9	12	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	6	6	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	16	29	5	6	4	0	1	2	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	6	7	6	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	23

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	5
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

Friday 6/3/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	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	

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	70%	49%	55%				63%	54%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						50%	53%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%							44%	54%
Math Achievement	46%	32%	42%				61%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains	52%						58%	52%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27%							45%	52%
Science Achievement	61%	45%	54%					61%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	92%	52%	59%					72%	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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	50%	-50%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	47%	-47%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	48%	-48%	55%	-55%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	47%	-47%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	29%	-29%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	57%	-57%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	68%	-68%	71%	-71%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	54%	-54%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

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	22	25		19	45						
ELL	63			50							
ASN	73			75							
BLK	64	59		33	41		72				
HSP	67	76		40	50	30	44				
MUL	50			47							
WHT	77	58	36	50	59		64	88			
FRL	67	57	50	44	39	20	59				
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	22	25		19	45						
ELL	63			50							
ASN	73			75							
BLK	64	59		33	41		72				
HSP	67	76		40	50	30	44				
MUL	50			47							
WHT	77	58	36	50	59		64	88			
FRL	67	57	50	44	39	20	59				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	25		19	45						
ELL	63			50							
ASN	73			75							
BLK	64	59		33	41		72				
HSP	67	76		40	50	30	44				
MUL	50			47							
WHT	77	58	36	50	59		64	88			
FRL	67	57	50	44	39	20	59				

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	501
Total Components for the Federal Index	9

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	86%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	57
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	74
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	54
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	51
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	49
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	62
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	48
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?

Trends found according to the data follow:

- Overall math scores in most grade levels were lower compared to the District, State, and comparable virtual education providers in the state. This is especially true in the higher levels of math.
- There is a substantial difference in achievement levels between students based on the instructional curriculum/provider they were exposed to throughout the year, Edgenuity vs. FLVS Franchise. FLVS students significantly outperformed Edgenuity students in most subject areas. It is most evident in the area of math.
- Disparity and inconsistency of teacher performance in the same grade level or subject area.
- The Family Engagement survey revealed a need to improve the school's community engagement; specifically, students' social interactions, field experience opportunities, and parent/community involvement.

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

Subject area and teacher performance data.

Elementary Math FSA data:

3rd-grade achievement increased 3 points from the previous yr.

4th-grade achievement remained the same as the previous yr.

5th-grade achievement decreased 3 points from the previous yr.

All grade levels in this category performed below the state by 23, 6, and 21 points respectively.

3rd and 5th grade performed lower than FLVS by 10 and 11 points respectively.

Middle School Math FSA data:

6th-grade- Edge. increased 9 points from the previous yr. and below the state by 9 points. FLVS decreased 13 points from the previous yr. and was higher than the state by 1 point.

7th-grade- Edge. increased 10 points from the previous yr. and above the state by 5 points. FLVS increased 27 points from the previous yr. and was higher than the state by 23 points.

8th-grade- Edge. decreased 10 points from the previous yr. and below the state by 28 points. FLVS has no data for the grade.

Math EOCs data:

Algebra1-Edge. decreased by 10 points from the previous yr. and below the state by 26 points. FLVS increased 24 points from the previous yr. and was higher than the state by 37 points.

Geometry- Edge. decreased 9 points from the previous yr. and below the state by 31 points. FLVS decreased 18 points from the previous yr. and was higher than the state by 4points.

Family engagement Consignia survey lowest ranking areas: families communicating with each other, parent involvement, face-to-face student interactions, and fieldwork opportunities.

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

Contributing factors:

- Area of math:

Students working on two different instructional curricula/resources/providers. One of which, and in accordance with historical FSA student data, achieved notably higher results than the other. This difference affects all areas of the teaching-learning process especially: curriculum rigor, teacher expectations, supporting resources for students and teachers, engagement practices, academic integrity, assessments, and monitoring capabilities.

- Area of professional development:

Continued and consistent, grade level and subject area PLCs are essential. We must abide by common expectations and language of instruction in accordance with one provider and the school's goals. Connect student mastery levels/outcomes to the teacher. Decrease inconsistencies in the teacher evaluation process and provide teacher development congruent to individual needs, best practices, and effective instructional strategies in the virtual setting.

- Area of community engagement:

Because of the nature of the virtual school, students have less access to timely, face-to-face social interactions and fieldwork. This is also true for parent and community involvement.

- New actions:

Full-time VOL students will be working on one platform, FLVS. The student and teacher handbooks have been revised. School orientation was conducted to communicate changes and better prepare students for the school year. Teachers have been trained on guidelines, procedures, and expectations. Teachers have completed the FLVS franchise training and certification. VOL will continue to develop opportunities for students' social interactions, fieldwork, and parent/community involvement by creating a calendar of events and increasing participation in the SAC. Hybrid opportunities to engage will be made available.

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

Areas that showed the most improvement:

- 3rd, 4th, 7th, 9th, and 10th grade ELA in both Edge. and FLVS and 8th-grade ELA students in FLVS

- Civics students in FLVS

- US History

- 8th-grade science FLVS

Most of these surpassed state averages and in some cases FLVS school achievement levels.

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

Contributing factors to improvement:

- Strong PLC
- Strong content and resources in the FLVS platform
- Continued professional development
- Strong teacher support

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

1. Note-taking at the secondary level- Domain: Student, This involves students making notes in a systematic manner. Such note-taking has been linked to increased engagement, more generative learning, and greater self-efficacy. Of note, this is not providing students with notes or sharing them, but the student actually learning the skills of note-taking.
2. Teacher Clarity - Domain: Teacher, It involves clarity in organization, explanation and guided practice, and assessment of student learning. In a virtual school it also involves conducting quality DBAs and maintaining the highest levels of academic integrity. Clearly communicating the intentions of the lesson and success criteria, skills, knowledge, attitude, and values the student needs to learn to be successful.
3. Intelligent Tutoring System - Domain: Teacher, It involves providing instructional advice on a one-on-one or small group basis (MTSS) and developing and testing the model about the cognitive process.

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.

1. Conduct all math DBAs
2. Deep dive into the new FLVS curriculum to analyze the rigor of standards and supplement if needed, full overview of the B.E.S.T. standards, access to BIG ideas math series, and the use of Math Mash Up.
3. Provide tiered small group instruction
4. Student progress discussions with grade-level PLCs
5. Facilitate training on evidence-based strategies during PLCs and during ERPLs

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

VOL teachers must ensure students are meeting and exceeding learning by conducting timely progress monitoring and providing specific performance feedback. Weekly PLCs will be working together towards this goal. The administration will provide meaningful feedback in a timely manner based on walk-throughs, observations, and data. Students were provided with digital manipulatives for math and we will be offering a targeted math Algebra 1 math course with built-in interventions to those students that score L1 or L2 on the EOC.

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.

Our needs assessment for the year revealed that the school's math achievements compared to the state and other similar virtual instruction providers in the state were significantly below in most grade levels. We also saw a significant discrepancy in achievement levels of students in the FLVS provider platform juxtaposed to those on the Edgenuity provider platform. The goal is to increase math achievement levels in all grades considering the following:

1. Students that transition from the Edge. platform to the FLVS platform this year will significantly reduce the achievement gap, getting as close as possible to the achievement levels of students that historically get their math instruction from FLVS.
2. VOL students on the FLVS platform will match or exceed the achievement levels of their counterparts in the FLVS School.
3. Get all VOL students to attain or exceed the state proficiency index in the subject matter.
4. VOL students who have already met or exceeded state achievement levels will sustain or improve from the previous year.

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

Achievement goals per grade level:

- 3rd - increase 23%, from 35% to 58% (FLVS-Franchise to State)
- 4th - increase 6%, from 55% to 61% (FLVS-Franchise to State)
- 5th - increase 21%, from 31% to 52% (FLVS-Franchise to State)
- 6th - increase 10%, from 40% to 50% (Edge to FLVS-Franchise, State less than FLVS-Franchise performance at 49%)
- 7th - increase 18%, from 51% to 69% (Edge to FLVS-Franchise, State less than FLVS-Franchise performance at 46%)
- 8th - increase 28%, from 14% to 42% (Edge to State, no current FLVS data)
- Algebra 1 - increase 26%, from 28% to 54% (Edge to State, FLVS-Franchise performance at 91%)
- Geometry - increase 31%, from 19% to 50% (Edge to State, FLVS-Franchise performance at 54%)

By May of 2023 95% of VOL teachers will:

- use evidence-based strategies (below)
- require note-taking
- provide instructional advice based on benchmark and classroom assessments on a one-on-one basis (DBAs)

Teachers will monitor students' understanding during one-on-one tutoring, live lessons, and DBAs (PLCs will discuss best DBA practices for consistency of delivery and understanding of, new, B.E.S.T standards). Teachers will ensure academic integrity. In addition, teachers will monitor students' progress, pacing, and grade on a weekly basis.

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

The administration will monitor teachers:

- track note-taking through surveys
- teacher clarity and engagement strategies through live lesson walkthroughs
- feedback through DBA and tutoring walkthroughs

The entire school will use progress monitoring and classroom data to track student/teacher growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

1. Note-taking - Domain: Student, This involves students making notes in a systematic manner. Such note-taking has been linked to increased engagement, more generative learning, and greater self-efficacy. Of note, this is not providing students with notes or sharing them, but the student actually learning the skills of note-taking.
2. Teacher Clarity - Domain: Teacher, It involves clarity in organization, explanation and guided practice and assessment of student learning. It includes clearly communicating the intentions of the lesson and success criteria (skills, knowledge, attitude, and values the student needs to learn.
3. Engagement - Domain: Student, Effectively planned time within a lesson that elicits active student participation.
4. Feedback - Domain: Teacher, Systematic and planned channels from student to teacher designed to demonstrate understanding and from teacher to student designed to refine and enhance teaching and learning.

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

1. Note-taking - According to Hattie's Visible Learning has an effect size of 0.51.
2. Teacher Clarity - According to Hattie's Visible Learning has an effect size of 0.76.
3. Engagement - A number of the strategies in Hattie's meta-analysis would fall into the broad category of engagement. Particular strategies to deliberately engage students in self-learning (such as jigsaw) had high effect sizes (1.20) as did teaching strategies designed to engage students with appropriate content (such as scaffolding, effect size of .82)
4. Feedback - According to Hattie's Visible Learning has an effect size of .70

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.

1. Review last year's data and achievement goals with grade-level PLCs.
2. Facilitate training on evidence-based strategies during PLCs.
3. Monitor teachers - assuring they are conducting progress monitoring of students and that they are providing specific performance feedback in a timely manner.
4. Ensure weekly PLCs are working together to discuss B.E.S.T standards, clarity, pacing, and development and implementation of PLC-created DBAs.
5. A school leadership team made up of administration and teachers will come together once a month to discuss what is working, needs to improve, best practices, and innovation in instruction in the virtual world.
6. Develop and implement interventions (including the intelligent tutoring system) to support students in need based on prior year test scores, FLVS progress and performance, and/or FAST data.
7. Monitor student progress and performance in FLVS courses
8. Monitor implementation of strategies through ongoing administrative walk-throughs and feedback.
9. Administration will identify teachers in need of support and will provide additional instructional coaching and training.

Person Responsible

Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	<p>Our needs assessment for the year revealed that the school's teacher performance per grade level and/or subject area was inconsistent. We also saw a significant discrepancy in achievement levels of students from teachers that taught on the FLVS platform juxtaposed to those on the Edgenuity platform. The goal, taking into account student achievement data and the district's goal of, "engaging all students in high levels of learning every day", is to decrease achievement gaps. Additionally, for students of the same grade level/subject area by achieving uniformity and consistency in teacher performance.</p>
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	<p>-100% of VOL teachers will attend weekly online and monthly face-to-face PLCs where they will disaggregate performance, pacing, and academic integrity data to ensure students demonstrate mastery of B.E.S.T standards and achievement in various depths of knowledge as it pertains to Math and ELA.</p> <p>-100% of VOL teachers will participate in all district and school ERPLs.</p> <p>-The administration will provide meaningful feedback in a timely manner based on walk-throughs, observations, and data to 100% of the teachers.</p> <p>By May of 2023 95% of VOL teachers will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -use evidence-based strategies (below) -require note-taking -provide instructional advice based on benchmark and classroom assessments on a one-on-one basis (DBAs)
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	<p>Additional teacher support and instructional coaching: by April 2023, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2 and 3 support will decrease by 80%.</p> <p>Teachers will monitor students' understanding during one-on-one tutoring, live lessons, and DBAs (PLCs will discuss best DBA practices for consistency of delivery and understanding of, new, B.E.S.T standards). Teachers will ensure academic integrity. In addition, teachers will monitor students' progress, pacing, and grade on a weekly basis.</p> <p>The administration will monitor teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -track note-taking through surveys -teacher clarity and engagement strategies through live lesson walkthroughs -feedback through DBA and tutoring walkthroughs <p>The entire school will use progress monitoring and classroom data to track student/teacher growth.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Note-taking - Domain: Student, This involves students making notes in a systematic manner. Such note-taking has been linked to increased engagement, more generative learning, and greater self-efficacy. Of note, this is not providing students with notes or sharing them, but the student actually learning the skills of note-taking. 2. Teacher Clarity - Domain: Teacher, It involves clarity in organization, explanation and guided practice and assessment of student learning. It includes clearly communicating the

intentions of the lesson and success criteria (skills, knowledge, attitude, and values the student needs to learn.

3. Engagement - Domain: Student, Effectively planned time within a lesson that elicits active student participation.

4. Feedback - Domain: Teacher, Systematic and planned channels from student to teacher designed to demonstrate understanding and from teacher to student designed to refine and enhance teaching and learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

1. Note-taking - According to Hattie's Visible Learning has an effect size of 0.51.
2. Teacher Clarity - According to Hattie's Visible Learning has an effect size of 0.76.
3. Engagement - A number of the strategies in Hattie's meta-analysis would fall into the broad category of engagement. Particular strategies to deliberately engage students in self-learning (such as jigsaw) had high effect sizes (1.20) as did teaching strategies designed to engage students with appropriate content (such as scaffolding, effect size of .82)
4. Feedback - According to Hattie's Visible Learning has an effect size of .70

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.

1. Review last year's data and achievement goals with grade-level PLCs.
2. Facilitate training on evidence-based strategies during PLCs.
3. Monitor teachers - assuring they are conducting progress monitoring of students and that they are providing specific performance feedback in a timely manner.
4. Ensure weekly PLCs are working together to discuss B.E.S.T standards, clarity, pacing, and development and implementation of PLC-created DBAs.
5. A school leadership team made up of administration and teachers will come together once a month to discuss what is working, needs to improve, best practices, and innovation in instruction in the virtual world.
6. Develop and implement interventions (including the intelligent tutoring system) to support students in need based on prior year test scores, FLVS progress and performance, and/or FAST data.
7. Monitor student progress and performance in FLVS courses
8. Monitor implementation of strategies through ongoing administrative walk-throughs and feedback.
9. Administration will identify teachers in need of support and will provide additional instructional coaching and training.

Person

Responsible

Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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.

For VOL the most critical component of establishing and maintaining positive relationships between all stakeholders is communication and involvement opportunities. This year, it began with the selection of our new school mascot by the vote of the school's community members. We are happy to report that our school mascot is the FOX!

VOL's primary focus in building a positive school culture is on strong student-teacher and parent-teacher relationships.

- Communication plays a vital role in the virtual world. Teachers are expected to communicate multiple times a month and in a variety of ways such as email, text, live lessons, and voice-to-voice with each student a minimum of once a month.
- Yearly school orientation designed to familiarize students and parents with our virtual school is made available. During this time school leaders discuss the role of the learning coach, student expectations, live lessons, DBAs, academic integrity, school attendance, student daily tasks, technology requirements and assistance, resources, important contact information such as counselors and registrars, revocation from VOL, and state testing information. Here we also celebrate the previous year's accomplishments.
- At the elementary level we also conducted parent support sessions.
- All students receive a welcome letter and call. This gives the teacher an opportunity to get to know his/her students personally, this is where the student-teacher relationship begins.
- Course and state test tutoring are available throughout the year to ensure mastery of content and achievement levels. Especially in those courses that have a graduation testing requirement attached to them.
- Creating meaningful student involvement opportunities such as meet-ups, field trips, fieldwork, and SAC, among others.
- Creating meaningful parent involvement through SAC.
- Yearly revision of student/parent and teacher handbooks to make certain expectations are outlined properly. This allows for a cohesive message, procedures, and delivery.
- Monthly school newsletter to ensure all stakeholders are informed of important information and events.
- Culture-building activities and items (such as staff team-building trips, staff shirts, staff incentives, etc.) to boost teacher and staff morale.

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

SAC committee includes representation of all stakeholders. Committee members meet monthly to review school needs, focus areas and allocate funds for request that support goals for school improvement. VOL has a teacher leadership team that also meet monthly. The team examines teaching strategies and practices to ensure student needs are met and to foster a positive school culture through collaboration, meet-ups, fieldwork opportunities, etc. Below are some of the most important school community occasions.

- Overall school, Anthony Serianni (Principal)

- SAC, Ida Sierra
- Veteran's Day Family Connections, Meri Albert
- Celebrate Literacy Week (Elementary)
- Red Ribbon Week – Polly Wilson
- Holiday Spirit Week – Meri Albert and Amy Ervin
- Battle of the Books and Spelling Bee - Ariel Kavanagh
- Mile Run Club
- Sunshine Committee - Amy Ervin
- VOL Annual Beach Day at Any Romano - Coach Harold LeRoy
- VOL Annual Fun Walk at Gemini Springs - Coach Harold LeRoy
- VOL Trunk-or-Treat - Amy Ervin
- Community Outreach - Meri Albert