

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Hillsborough Virtual School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Hillsborough Virtual School

2704 N HIGHLAND AVE, Tampa, FL 33602

www.hillsboroughvirtual.com

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide an education that allows each student to excel as successful and responsible online learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's set a graduation rate goal of 90%. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

To be the state's leader in providing quality virtual education to all students.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hoff, Matthew	Director of Virtual Instruction K12	Use student data to make decisions regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * New units * Student placements * Resource allocation Monitor the SIP plan for fidelity through monthly walkthroughs of VSA and Educator <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Conduct accountability conversations with teachers when warranted
Upshaw, Denee	Supervisor of Innovative Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitor the SIP plan for fidelity through monthly walkthroughs of VSA and Educator * Conduct accountability conversations with teachers when warranted - Chair Steering Committee - Analyze student data in order to make decisions about best practices in the virtual environment. - Facilitate monthly student data meetings - Provide administrator communication with the parents of at-risk students
Francis, Tiffany	Supervisor of Innovative Programs	Monitor the SIP plan for fidelity through monthly walkthroughs of VSA and Educator <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analyze data in order to make decisions about best practices in the virtual environment. - Attend monthly student data meetings
Hillgruber, Sherri	Coordinator of Innovative Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitor the SIP plan for fidelity through monthly walkthroughs of VSA and Educator - Analyze data in order to make decisions about best practices in the virtual environment. - Attend monthly student data meetings - Provide administrator communication with the parents of at-risk students - Oversee ESE Services
Allen, Amanda		Attend monthly student data meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Following data meetings, communicate with parents of at-risk students - Provide data and recommendations to administration in regards to at-risk students
Campbell, Kristin		Attend monthly student data meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Following data meetings, communicate with parents of at-risk students - Provide data and recommendations to administration in regards to at-risk students

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Carmicheal, Christy		Attend monthly student data meetings - Following data meetings, communicate with parents of at-risk students - Provide data and recommendations to administration in regards to at-risk students

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Faculty and stakeholders were presented with a comparative overview of Progress Monitoring data. The data demonstrated student growth across grade levels and achievement levels. Stakeholders were then asked to disaggregate the data based on subject/grade level. This information was utilized when constructing the goals for the 2023-2024 school year.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Stakeholders will meet following the administration of PM 1 and PM 2. to assess student learning. Based on these results, the Leadership Team will meet with individual departments to revise content delivery to ensure that student instructional needs are being supported.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	16%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN)

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: I 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	5	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	15	24	8	14	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	24	25	22	34	23	34	32	27	23	378
Course failure in Math	18	17	15	14	27	35	38	35	29	343
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	10	16	4	7	6	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	43	31	45	10	17	15	161
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	4	24

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	24	25	22	34	23	34	32	27	23	244
Course failure in Math	18	17	15	14	27	35	38	35	29	228
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	10	16	4	7	6	56
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	43	31	45	10	17	15	161
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	4	15

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	68	51	53	51	51	55	75		
ELA Learning Gains				65			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			59		
Math Achievement*	44	50	55	37	41	42	61		
Math Learning Gains				48			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39			37		
Science Achievement*	65	48	52	39	48	54	64		
Social Studies Achievement*	79	65	68	45	57	59	79		
Middle School Acceleration	58	70	70	78	51	51	46		
Graduation Rate	88	83	74	85	44	50	98		
College and Career Acceleration	34	33	53	46	68	70	62		
ELP Progress	73	52	55	53	73	70	58		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	583
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	90
Graduation Rate	88

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	640
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	66
Graduation Rate	85

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	45			
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	64			
HSP	60			
MUL	69			
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	69			
FRL	59			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	44			
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	56			
HSP	59			
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	57			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	68			44			65	79	58	88	34	73
SWD	50			27			39	60		5	6	
ELL	58			40			47	70		38	7	73
AMI												
ASN	86			61							2	
BLK	64			37			49	84		26	7	
HSP	68			39			61	78	35	35	9	70

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL	71			46			88	75		40	6	
PAC												
WHT	77			57			75	78	74	36	8	
FRL	73			33			67	69		31	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	51	65	54	37	48	39	39	45	78	85	46	53
SWD	43	59	50	40	29	12	30	65		77	30	
ELL	62	68	54	46	46	27	43	67		60		53
AMI												
ASN	91	77		86	73		92		100	100	91	
BLK	57	51	44	43	44	37	48	79	91	83	36	
HSP	68	66	58	47	44	35	59	78	82	79	35	59
MUL	84	81		56	69		81	91		83	60	
PAC												
WHT	76	62	46	52	40	41	75	81	56	89	48	
FRL	63	61	57	38	40	38	60	76	65	81	43	58

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	75	66	59	61	45	37	64	79	46	98	62	58
SWD	52	80		52	47							
ELL	64	76	80	36	36							58
AMI												
ASN	89	75		81	67		85					
BLK	64	57	47	43	33	31	42	86	46			
HSP	71	68	59	51	43	27	61	74	45	100	60	65
MUL	75	65		76	37		81		53			
PAC												
WHT	80	67	59	72	52	57	67	74	43	97	55	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
FRL	62	59	54	47	35	23	48	64	37	94	67	68

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	74%	50%	24%	50%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	53%	19%	54%	18%
07	2023 - Spring	74%	47%	27%	47%	27%
08	2023 - Spring	74%	44%	30%	47%	27%
09	2023 - Spring	78%	48%	30%	48%	30%
04	2023 - Spring	65%	54%	11%	58%	7%
06	2023 - Spring	60%	47%	13%	47%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	70%	46%	24%	50%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	56%	53%	3%	54%	2%
07	2023 - Spring	33%	36%	-3%	48%	-15%
03	2023 - Spring	39%	55%	-16%	59%	-20%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	59%	-4%	61%	-6%
08	2023 - Spring	72%	57%	15%	55%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	34%	53%	-19%	55%	-21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	64%	41%	23%	44%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	50%	47%	3%	51%	-1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	55%	0%	50%	5%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	49%	6%	48%	7%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	62%	18%	63%	17%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	64%	10%	66%	8%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	65%	13%	63%	15%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

3rd - 8th grade PMS testing for math generated an overall 51% pass rate with 349 students testing. Algebra and Geometry both saw a 55% pass rate with 88 students and 60 students respectively.

5th Grade Math had the lowest performance rate with a 33% pass rate on PM 3. Out of the 54 students that took the exam, 18 received a 3 or higher. While this was the first year of the PMS testing cycle, the 2022 SIP plan noted a negative trend in 5th grade mathematics. It should be noted that in 2022 106 students tested. In 2023, 54 students tested.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

3rd Grade Math had the greatest decline. In 2022, 71% of 133 students passed the FSA. In 2023, 39% of 54 students passed the PM3 exam.

As noted, there was a significant decline in the population. This is also a new test.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

3rd Grade Math (-20) and 5th Grade Math (-22) had the greatest gap between state and school data. As noted above, there has been a 3-year negative trend for 5th grade.

9th Grade ELA had the greatest positive gap with 78% pass rate compared to the State's 48% pass rate.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

8th Grade math saw a 7% increase. 6th Grade math saw a 6% increase. All other components showed less than 5% increases.

Teachers were encouraged to create help videos.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

An area of concern, identified via the Early Warning System indicators, is mathematics. 71 students, in grades 4-8, scored a level 1 on the mathematics PM3 examination.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Mathematics: Learning Gains

Mathematics: Bottom Quartile Learning Gains

Grade 5 Mathematics

Grade 3 Mathematics

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Hillsborough Virtual continues to pursue a 7-year goal to increase our Math Achievement level. In 2023, Hillsborough Virtual 51% of students in grades 3-8 earned a 3 or higher on the PM3 examination. 55% of students in Algebra and Geometry earned a 3 or higher on the EOC. When students attend live lessons, and complete their courses on time, they will be able to master the skills requisite to succeed in math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Math Achievement will increase to 65%.

Monitoring:

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

When providing feedback for DBAs, teachers will note areas that the student needs to improve. Teachers will also log remediation opportunities provided to students in VSA. Administration will review teacher logs, bi-annually, through VSA and Educator walk-throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denee Upshaw (denee.upshaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

- 1) Learning gains will be evaluated, throughout the semester, through discussion-based assessments, module exams, and final exams. Student learning gains will increase on PM and EOC formatives.
- 2) Student progress will be reviewed monthly to ensure that students are making adequate progress to successfully complete their mathematics course on time
- 3) Students will be required to attend a minimum of 2 live lessons per semester.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- 1) Monitoring and analyzing current student data, will allow teachers to design intervention strategies based off student performance. Targeting weaknesses will allow students the opportunity to review content to promote mastery.
- 2) In order to succeed on formative exams, it is imperative that students complete their courses on time. Monitoring course performance monthly will allow teachers to provide extra support to students that are not maintaining pace.
- 3) Direct instruction allows students the opportunity to interact with both the instructor and the curriculum. Student learning will increase when they have the opportunity to have misconceptions cleared up during the initial learning of a topic.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

During Welcome Calls, mathematics teachers will inform parents and students that statistics prove that students that attend live lessons, and face to face review sessions, perform at higher levels than those that do not.

Person Responsible: Denee Upshaw (denee.upshaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: VSA will be reviewed by the end of the first 9-weeks.

Teachers will actively monitor student data, identifying skills that students need to master, in order to structure live lessons that focus on student need.

Person Responsible: Denee Upshaw (denee.upshaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing. Will complete during teacher walk throughs of VSA data.

Teachers will encourage participation in live lessons and face to face pre-test review sessions through phone calls, emails, and texts.

Person Responsible: Denee Upshaw (denee.upshaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing. Will complete during teacher walk throughs of VSA data.

Students struggling, after the first nine weeks, will be individually invited to live lesson, face to face review sessions, and private help sessions.

Person Responsible: Denee Upshaw (denee.upshaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing. Will complete during teacher walk throughs of VSA data.

School Counselors will meet with administration bi-weekly to discuss student performance and strategically target students struggling in math

Person Responsible: Christy Carmicheal (christy.carmicheal@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing. Will complete during teacher walk throughs of VSA data.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Hillsborough Virtual considers it important for students to leave high school with certifications and credits that will prepare them for their future. While students graduating with AP Credits, Dual Enrollment Credits, and/or Industry Certifications significantly increased during the 2020 school year to 62%. The years following saw data decline to 48%. This can be attributed to fluctuations within the population due to Covid policies.

It is important to note this is delayed data. The data for the 2022 and 2023 are not currently available.

Measurable Outcome:

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

65% of Hillsborough Virtual Seniors will graduate with either an AP credit, a Dual Enrollment credit, or with an Industry Certification.

Monitoring:

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

Student transcripts will be monitored (see action steps) by all high school counselors to ensure that all students have the appropriate courses to meet this goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denee Upshaw (denee.upshaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

- 1) Senior transcripts will reflect that students earned either AP credit, Dual Enrollment credit, and/or an Industry Certification
- 2) By May of their Junior year, student transcripts will be reviewed to ensure that they have achieved the requisite credit and/or certification. If they have not met this requirement, they will have the requisite courses scheduled for their Senior year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- 1) Intentional monitoring of student enrollment in CCC courses will ensure that all students are afforded the opportunity to earn either AP credit, Dual Enrollment credit, and/or an Industry Certification.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Students and parents will be made aware of, and encouraged to enroll in, AP, Dual Enrollment, and/or courses that provide Industry Certification.

Person Responsible: Denee Upshaw (denee.upshaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: On-going

All Senior transcripts will be reviewed by September 31st to ensure that they are on track to meet this requirement.

Person Responsible: Christy Carmicheal (christy.carmicheal@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 31st

All Junior transcripts will be reviewed by December to ensure that they are on track to meet this requirement their Senior year.

Person Responsible: Christy Carmicheal (christy.carmicheal@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: December 22nd

All Sophomore transcripts will be reviewed by May to ensure that they are on track to meet this requirement.

Person Responsible: Christy Carmicheal (christy.carmicheal@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 26th

When necessary, schedules will be adjusted to ensure that all students are provided with this opportunity..

Person Responsible: Christy Carmicheal (christy.carmicheal@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: On-going

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A positive school culture provides a learning environment where students are able to succeed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will successfully complete their courses by the semester deadline.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will monitor student progress throughout the semester to ensure students are on track to finish successfully.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denee Upshaw (denee.upshaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will facilitate a growth mindset. This will be accomplished via both written and verbal feedback. Students will also be encouraged to work towards mastery.

Stakeholders will be provided with timely information about student achievement.

Students will also be provided opportunities to be part of the learning community.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By promoting a growth mindset and ensuring that all stakeholders are informed of student progress, students will find the support they need to thrive in the virtual environment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Growth Mindset: - Teachers foster student growth by providing specific feedback on all written assignments. Feedback is designed to inform students of what they did well and areas where they could improve. Students are encouraged to utilize this feedback to reassess their submissions.

Person Responsible: Denee Upshaw (denee.upshaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: On-going

Zero-Out Policy: To ensure that all stakeholders have access to accurate information as to the student's grade and pace, teachers will update student grades with scores for missing assignments.

Person Responsible: Denee Upshaw (denee.upshaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: First Tuesday of every month.

Communication with Stakeholders - Teachers communicate with parents and students, once a month, in regard to grades and pacing. If a student does not submit work weekly, this communication becomes more frequent.

Person Responsible: Denee Upshaw (denee.upshaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Guidance will host bi-annual informational sessions regarding Bright Futures, Financial Aide, and the College Admission process.

Person Responsible: Christy Carmicheal (christy.carmicheal@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of each semester

Field Trips: - Students are provided with opportunities to attend learning based field trips in our community. These opportunities include, but are not limited to, kayaking trips, to learn about marine life, and museums.

Person Responsible: Denee Upshaw (denee.upshaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: on-going

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Hillsborough Virtual analyzed our school PM3 data, comparing it to both previous years data and state/district data. This analysis demonstrated a need to create a specific focus area for both 3rd grade and 5th grade mathematics.

33% of 5th grade students earned a 3 or higher on PM3. The pass rate was 22 points lower than the state average.

39% of 3rd grade students earned a 3 or higher on the PM3. The pass rate was 20 points lower than the state average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Math Achievement in 3rd and 5th grade will increase to 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will monitor lesson mastery via formative and non-formative assessments. They will create help videos and/or offer small group instruction based on student needs. Teachers will log remediation opportunities provided to students in VSA.

Administration will review teacher logs, bi-annually, through VSA and Educator walk-throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denee Upshaw (denee.upshaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will create specific help videos for the lessons that more than 25% struggle with.

Teachers will disaggregate data to identify areas for remediation.

When appropriate, teachers will offer small groups based on students' need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By identifying areas of weakness, teachers will be able to target specific gaps in student learning. This will allow teachers to structure help sessions, and/or videos reviews, around student needs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 will identify lessons where more than 25% of students struggle.

They will then disaggregate the data to determine the concept that is problematic.

Person Responsible: Denee Upshaw (denee.upshaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: On-going.

Teachers will create help videos reviewing content.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: On-going

Teachers will offer small group sessions as needed. Student invitation and attendance will be logged in VSA.

Person Responsible: Denee Upshaw (denee.upshaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: VSA will be reviewed quarterly.