

The School District of Lee County

Lee County Virtual Franchise School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	34
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	34
VI. Title I Requirements	36
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	37

Lee County Virtual Franchise

2855 COLONIAL BLVD, Fort Myers, FL 33966

<http://lvip.leeschools.net>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 10/17/2023.

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.

The mission of Lee Virtual School is to ensure each student achieves his/her highest personal potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Lee Virtual School is to be a world class virtual school and expand all access to all students rigorous, relevant curriculum that incorporates skills and knowledge students need to succeed in global society.

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
McMillan Barnes, Jennifer	Principal	Budgets, Hiring, SAC/DAC, Evaluations/Observations, Data Team and Data Chats, Communications, Community Relationships. HRS team, School Improvement Plan Monitoring, Leadership Team Lead
Iovine, Martha	Assistant Principal	Collaborative Teams Monitoring, Graduation Rate Monitoring, School Improvement Plan Writer, ELL Monitoring, Testing K-12 Admin., Inventory, Student Services, Tutoring, APPLES, Professional Development, Intervention Codes, Gifted, Cambridge, Dual Enrollment
Berry, Meredith	Assistant Principal	Student Schedules and Enrollment, FLVS Contact, ESE Admin., Master Schedule, Registration, Mental Health Team

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.

During Preschool Week all staff members and administration engage in a review of data from the 22-23 school year. Goals are set by Collaborative Teams and action plans are created by the team. A Parent Open Forum was held in July where the SIP process was shared and input was provided by parents and students. Business partners participated in our preschool meeting as well about the SIP Development and goals.

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))

The SIP will be monitored by the leadership and data teams during biweekly meetings where the teams review progress for each tested area and data for students with the greatest achievement gaps. Adjustments to the plan will be revised based on results of progress monitoring.

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 PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	46%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	11%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) 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: C 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	1	1	2	2	3	5	6	8	9	37
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	2	7	6	12	7	11	9	10	66
Course failure in Math	1	0	4	6	9	3	8	7	12	50
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	2	2	7	6	12	7	11	9	10	66
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	1	0	4	6	9	3	8	7	12	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	2	7	6	12	7	11	9	10	66

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	1	1	2	2	3	5	6	8	9	37

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	10	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4

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	1	1	2	2	3	5	6	8	9	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	2	2	7	6	12	7	11	9	10	138
Course failure in Math	1	0	4	6	9	3	8	7	12	88
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	2	2	7	6	12	7	11	9	10	138
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	1	0	4	6	9	3	8	7	12	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	2	7	6	12	7	11	9	10	138
	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	1	1	2	2	3	5	6	8	9	73

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	10	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	7

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	1	1	2	2	3	5	6	8	9	37
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	2	2	7	6	12	7	11	9	10	66
Course failure in Math	1	0	4	6	9	3	8	7	12	50
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	2	2	7	6	12	7	11	9	10	66
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	1	0	4	6	9	3	8	7	12	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	2	7	6	12	7	11	9	10	66
	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	1	1	2	2	3	5	6	8	9	37

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	10	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4

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*	55	45	53	56	48	55	67		
ELA Learning Gains				56			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			46		
Math Achievement*	38	48	55	33	37	42	53		
Math Learning Gains				47			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			30		
Science Achievement*	45	47	52	45	47	54	63		
Social Studies Achievement*	71	60	68	55	51	59	76		
Middle School Acceleration	47	77	70	47	42	51	53		
Graduation Rate	91	51	74	77	43	50	96		
College and Career Acceleration	40	33	53	50	66	70	61		
ELP Progress		47	55		69	70	70		

* 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	92
Graduation Rate	91

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	545
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	82
Graduation Rate	77

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	35	Yes	2	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	55			
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	72			

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	34	Yes	1	
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	51			
HSP	51			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	48			

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	55			38			45	71	47	91	40	
SWD	40			20			31	50			4	
ELL	53			33							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			27			33	64			4	
HSP	65			41			51	65	53	28	8	
MUL	53			40							2	
PAC												
WHT	53			38			45	75	43	44	7	
FRL										50	2	

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	56	56	37	33	47	42	45	55	47	77	50	
SWD	25	27	5	16	42	45	39	43		65	36	
ELL	53	45	9	30	32	50	31	58				
AMI												
ASN	79			75								
BLK	59	54		33	44		46	45		76	50	
HSP	62	50	26	38	45	43	55	73	44	77	48	
MUL	65	69		33	45		62					
PAC												
WHT	62	58	49	45	49	38	53	67	48	79	51	
FRL	60	52	15	30	44	47	44	60		67	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	67	55	46	53	35	30	63	76	53	96	61	70
SWD	38	50	48	25	45	42	30					
ELL	56	65	55	39	33		50					70
AMI												
ASN	100	85		92	50							
BLK	62	59	33	42	33	25	73	65				
HSP	64	57	55	47	32	28	61	74	54	88	50	68
MUL	61	50		48	26							
PAC												
WHT	69	52	41	57	38	34	64	78	51	98	60	
FRL										83	80	

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	53%	45%	8%	50%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	55%	48%	7%	54%	1%
07	2023 - Spring	64%	44%	20%	47%	17%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	44%	15%	47%	12%
09	2023 - Spring	51%	46%	5%	48%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	56%	11%	58%	9%
06	2023 - Spring	59%	44%	15%	47%	12%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	42%	7%	50%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	50%	52%	-2%	54%	-4%
07	2023 - Spring	39%	37%	2%	48%	-9%
03	2023 - Spring	26%	55%	-29%	59%	-33%
04	2023 - Spring	31%	61%	-30%	61%	-30%
08	2023 - Spring	56%	60%	-4%	55%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	16%	52%	-36%	55%	-39%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	47%	43%	4%	44%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	30%	50%	-20%	51%	-21%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	39%	39%	0%	50%	-11%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	36%	43%	-7%	48%	-12%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	52%	50%	2%	63%	-11%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	59%	8%	66%	1%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	54%	14%	63%	5%

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.

After analyzing our data components, including our most recent progress monitoring and 2023 state assessments. Math achievement demonstrates the greatest need for improvement. This has been a trend for several years.

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

After analyzing our data components, NGSSS Science (5th and 8th grade Science and the Biology EOC) showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Some factors that contributed to this decline are poor student attendance to live lessons, lack of effort, and engagement with the teacher.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 5th grade Math and percent proficiency. The state average was 55% passing and Lee Virtual School's percent passing was 17%. Contributing factors were poor student attendance to live lessons, lack of student effort and poor student engagement with the teacher.

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

Based off progress monitoring and 2023 state assessments, our reading scores showed the most improvement. The new actions our school took in this area:

- * Significant increase in teachers including school-wide training & professional development opportunities with teachers sharing best practices within weekly PLC's.
- * Personalized student instruction
- * time on task
- * pass rate
- * data chats (quarterly) with teachers & students
- * Student led conferences
- * Implementation literacy strategies throughout content areas

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

One potential area of concern from the EWS data is the number of course failures in ELA.

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

Our priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are as follows:

1. Increasing Math proficiency
2. Increasing Science proficiency
3. Increasing student attendance at required state testing so as to have 95% of our students in attendance

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**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.

Lee Virtual School's Students with Disabilities was identified on the Federal Index as an area that was below 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Lee Virtual School will increase the percentage of proficiency for Students with Disabilities to 42% or higher as measured by the Federal Index by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be monitored biweekly in the leadership and data team meetings specifically monitoring individual student progress. Collaborative teams will meet weekly with the literacy coach who will offer support to teachers and small groups. Students meet weekly with their ESE CoTeacher who provides individualized instruction based on data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jenniferm@leeschools.net)

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 use data from the i-Ready diagnostic in both Reading and Math coupled with data from the iReady learning path. The diagnostic will provide intervention groupings and ancillary materials to use for targeted small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

iReady is an evidence based program that monitors and tracks the BEST standards in reading and math. Individual Education Plans (IEP) provide individual accommodations for the school and teachers to follow to make sure every ESE student has supports to be successful.

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 1 - Strong Evidence

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.

The first action step is to discuss current data and set goals with each teacher for their specific SWD students. These goals will be individual by student based on progress monitoring data. The ESE teacher will meet with the parent to discuss each individual student's data and set end of year goals.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jenniferm@leeschools.net)

By When: August 10,2023

The second action step is for the ESE teacher to attend Collaborative Team meetings weekly to discuss formative data collected by the reading, ELA, and math teacher. The ESE teacher will use this data to target standards in their individual student conferences with each student.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Collaborative Teams meet weekly

The third step is quarterly data chats with teachers specifically reviewing the SWD in their class and discussing strategies to raise their achievement.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly Data Chats October, January, March

#2. 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 schoolwide Freshmen Success Program is critical to set up 9th grade students for on time graduation. The program will increase student engagement, foster school pride, and provide accountability checkpoints to ensure every students is on track to graduate on time.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Lee Virtual School 9th grade students will decrease the number of course failures by 25% as compared to last year's 9th grade class.

Monitoring:

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

The 9th Grade Collaborative Team is using this goal as their common assessment data that they are tracking weekly during team time. The leadership and data team will also be reviewing on pace data biweekly to ensure students are on track.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jenniferm@leeschools.net)

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.)

The Freshmen class course completion data will be reviewed every 2 weeks. Students who are more than two weeks behind pace will be placed in a 9th Grade Homeroom and will receive monthly calls from the homeroom teacher to create a schedule and check pace at staying on that schedule. When a student is 4 weeks behind, a mandatory in person parent teacher conference is held.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Having one teacher working with individual students is more effective than having all 6 teachers calling a student about the same issue. One teacher making a plan with a student creates more motivation and connection between the student and the school.

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 1 - Strong Evidence

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.

The first action step is to identify the students who are 2 weeks behind in their coursework.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jenniferm@leeschools.net)

By When: After two weeks of school.

The second step is for the homeroom teacher to contact the student and parent to establish a connection and action plan with the family. The teacher will create an updated pacing chart for the student to use to catch up.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

The third step is to review completion data every two weeks adding and subtracting students from the homeroom. When a student is 4 weeks behind, and automatic parent teacher conference is scheduled.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: September through December every two weeks.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

Our English Language Learners subgroup was identified by the Federal Index as being below 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Lee Virtual School will increase the percentage of proficiency for English Language Learners to 42% or higher as measured by the Federal Index by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be monitored biweekly in the leadership and data team meetings specifically monitoring individual student progress. Collaborative teams will meet weekly with the literacy coach who will offer support to teachers and small groups. Students meet weekly with their ESOL paraprofessional who provides individualized support based on data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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 use data from the i-Ready diagnostic in both Reading and Math coupled with data from the iReady learning path. The diagnostic will provide intervention groupings and ancillary materials to use for targeted small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

iReady is an evidence based program that monitors and tracks the BEST standards in reading and math.

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 1 - Strong Evidence

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.

The first action step is to discuss current data and set goals with each teacher for their specific ELL students. These goals will be individual by student based on progress monitoring data. The ESOL para will meet with the parent to discuss each individual student's data and set end of year goals.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: By end of August 2023

The second action step is for the ESOL para to attend Collaborative Team meetings weekly to discuss formative data collected by the reading, ELA, and math teacher. The ELL para will use this data to target standards in their weekly help sessions.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Ongoing weekly throughout school year.

The third step is quarterly data chats with teachers specifically reviewing the ELL student data in their class and discussing strategies to raise their achievement.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly: October, January, March

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

One of Lee Virtual School's area of focus included 2nd grade ELA proficiency. Proficiency at 2nd grade is a priority because we have to make sure students are mastering the foundational skills before going to 3rd grade.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 23-24 school year, Lee Virtual School will increase proficiency in 2nd grade reading from 58% to 65% as measured by STAR PM 3.

Monitoring:

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

In order to monitor proficiency of 2nd grade ELA standards, the second grade teacher will build upon the systems that will include:

1. Weekly data analysis of formative assessments during Collaborative Team time to determine mastery on standards.
2. The literacy coach closely monitors PM 1 and PM 2 data in conjunction with iReady data to determine areas of support for small group instruction.
3. Administration of STAR Progress Monitoring (PM 1 and PM 2) with data analysis comparing to the district to identify areas in need of improvement and areas of strength.
4. Students have an ELA learning path in iReady that is also monitored by the teacher and literacy coach.
5. Students in 2nd grade are monitored biweekly by the leadership and data teams.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jenniferm@leeschools.net)

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.)

The i-Ready diagnostic identifies areas of improvement for each student and provides intervention resources to remediate in small groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

iReady is a research based program that offers individualized learning paths for students, provides independent practice, and identifies standards and resources for small group remediation.

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 1 - Strong Evidence

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.

The first action step is to discuss current data and set goals with the 2nd grade teacher.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: This will occur by August 10, 2023.

The second action step is for the teacher to create small groups based on data, establish a plan of action for remediation and enrichment, establish weekly formative checks to monitor progress.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Small group intervention monitoring: Weekly throughout the school year. Classroom observations: Twice per month.

The third action step is to share formative data during Collaborative Team time to ensure data collection/discussion is occurring and that specific areas for remediation and enrichment are identified according to the data to solicit support from the literacy coach and the Intervention Specialist.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Collaborative Team time is monitored weekly throughout the 23-24 school year.

The fourth action step is to implement quarterly data chats with the teacher and literacy coach to review our data compared with the district and state data. At this time, we will review strategies that are working and those that are not. We will also identify students who are not mastering standards and decide on a specific plan for remediation and try new strategies to engage the student.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Data chats will occur quarterly: Week of October 17th Week of January 9th Week of March 25th

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

Grade 3 ELA Proficiency is included as an area of focus for Lee Virtual School. Proficiency at 3rd grade is a priority in order to make sure students meet the 3rd grade requirement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 23-24 school year, Lee Virtual School will increase proficiency in 3rd grade ELA from 52% to 65% as measured on the PM 3 FAST ELA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

In order to monitor proficiency of the 3rd grade ELA standards, the 3rd grade teacher will build upon systems that are already in place and will include:

1. Weekly data analysis of formative assessments during Collaborative Team time to determine mastery on standards.
2. The literacy coach closely monitors PM 1 and PM 2 data in conjunction with iReady data to determine areas of support for small group instruction.
3. Administration of FAST PM1 and PM 2 with data analysis comparing to other schools and to the district. Areas of strength and areas of improvement will be identified and remediated.
4. Students have an ELA learning path in iReady that is monitored by the teacher and literacy coach.
5. Students are monitored biweekly by the leadership and data team to provide support to the teacher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jenniferm@leeschools.net)

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.)

The iReady diagnostic identifies areas of improvement for each student and provides intervention resources to remediate in small groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

iReady is a research based program that offers individualized learning paths for students, provides independent practice, and identifies standards and resources for small group remediation.

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 1 - Strong Evidence

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.

The first action step is to discuss data and set goals with the 3rd grade teacher. The teacher will identify standards in need of improvement from last year's FAST PM 3 data.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: This will occur by August 10, 2023.

The second action step is for the teacher to create small groups based on data, establish a plan of action to include strategies for remediation and enrichment, and establish formative checks to monitor progress.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Small group intervention monitoring: Weekly throughout the school year. Classroom observations: Twice per month.

The third actions step is to share formative data during weekly Collaborative Team time to ensure data collection/discussion is occurring and that support is solicited from the literacy coach and the intervention specialist.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Collaborative Team time is monitored weekly throughout the 23-24 school year.

The fourth action step is to implement quarterly data chats with the teacher and literacy coach to review our data compared with other schools and state data. At this time, we will review strategies that are working and those that are not. We will identify students who are not mastering standards and decide on a new plan of action for remediation by trying new strategies to engage the student.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Data chats occur quarterly: Week of October 17th Week of January 9th Week of March 25th

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

Another area of focus for Lee Virtual Schools included 3rd - 10th grade ELA Proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 23-24 school year, Lee Virtual School will increase proficiency in grade 3-10 ELA from 61% to 65% as measured by the PM 3 FAST ELA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

In order to monitor proficiency of the ELA standards for grades 3-8, the teachers will build upon systems that are already in place and will include:

1. Weekly data analysis of formative assessments during Collaborative Team time to determine mastery on standards.
2. The literacy coach closely monitors PM 1 and PM 2 data in conjunction with iReady data to determine areas of support for small group instruction.
3. Administration of FAST PM1 and PM 2 with data analysis comparing to other schools and to the district. Areas of strength and areas of improvement will be identified and remediated.
4. Students have an ELA learning path in iReady that is monitored by the teacher and literacy coach.
5. Students are monitored biweekly by the leadership and data team to provide support to the teacher.

In order to monitor proficiency of the ELA standards in grades 9 and 10, the teachers will use the same systems as described above; however, they will focus on the formative assessment data and the standards assessment data within the FLVS curriculum and platform, and will receive instruction using LCSD Instructional Materials used in StudySync. Below level students will receive small group remediation biweekly on lowest standards. Students will participate in data chats in the beginning of the year by setting a goal and reviewing standards they need to master to be proficient. After the initial goal setting, students will participate in student led conferences quarterly with the teacher to discuss progress and next steps in action plan for their learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jenniferm@leeschools.net)

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.)

Students in Grades 3-8 will use the iReady program as an evidence-based intervention program. Students will take the iReady diagnostic, which will identify areas of improvement for each student and provide intervention resources to the teacher to use in small groups.

All Grade 9 and 10 Level 2 FAST students scheduled in intensive reading will participate in Live Lessons facilitated by LVS teachers using LCSD Instructional Materials used in StudySync.

Grade 9 scheduled independently and grade 10 scheduled independently

Level 2 FAST students scheduled in intensive reading will participate in Live Lessons facilitated by LVS teachers using All Grade 9 and 10 Level 2 FAST students scheduled in intensive reading will participate in Live Lessons facilitated by LVS teachers using LCSD Instructional Materials used in StudySync.

Grade 9 scheduled independently and grade 10 scheduled independently

Level 2 FAST students scheduled in intensive reading will participate in Live Lessons facilitated by LVS

teachers using LCSD Instructional Materials used in StudySync.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

iReady is a research based program that offers individualized learning paths for students, provides independent practice, and identifies standards and resources for small group remediation.

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 1 - Strong Evidence

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.

The first action step is to review 22-23 data, discuss data on current students, and set goals with each teacher by grade level.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

The second step is for the teacher to identify standards for improvement, sort students into small groups, establish a plan of action for remediation and enrichment, and establish weekly formative checks to monitor progress.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Small group intervention monitoring: Weekly throughout the school year. Classroom observations: Twice per month

The third action step is to share formative data weekly during Collaborative Team time to ensure data collection/discuss is occurring and that specific areas of remediation and enrichment are identified according to the data to solicit support from the literacy coach and the intervention specialist.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Collaborative Teams is monitored weekly throughout the 23-24 school year.

The fourth action step is to implement quarterly data chats with each teacher and literacy coach to review our data compared to other schools, the district, and state data. At this time, we will review strategies that are working and those that are not. We will identify students who are not making progress towards mastery and decide on a specific plan for remediation along with new strategies to engage the student.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Data chats will occur quarterly: Week of October 17th Week of January 9th Week of March 25th

#7. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

Another area of focus for Lee Virtual Schools includes 8th Grade Science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 23-24 school year, Lee Virtual School will increase proficiency in 8th Grade Science from 49% to 55% as measured by the 8th Grade Science NGSSS.

Monitoring:

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

In order to monitor proficiency of the Grade 8 Science standards , the teacher will build upon systems that are already in place and will include:

1. Students will participate in all district progress monitoring. The teacher will use this data to develop a plan of action for remediating 6th and 7th grade standards and use district and FLVS resources as formative assessments to monitor progress towards mastery of these standards.
2. Weekly data analysis of formative assessments during Collaborative Team time to determine mastery on standards.
2. The teacher closely monitors PM 1 and PM 2 data to determine areas of support for small group instruction.
3. Administration of PM1 and PM 2 with data analysis comparing to other schools and to the district. Areas of strength and areas of improvement will be identified and remediated.
4. The teacher will monitor attendance at live lessons and completion rate of the course to ensure students stay on track..
5. Completion data for students is monitored biweekly by the leadership and data team to provide support to the teacher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jenniferm@leeschools.net)

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.)

Students are provided tutoring from the teacher using district resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

ESE teacher and ESOL paraprofessional provide support.

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 1 - Strong Evidence

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.

The first action step is to discuss results from 22-23 Grade 8 NGSSS Assessment, discuss current reading levels of the students and set goals with the teacher.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

The second action step is for the teacher to develop engaging live lessons based on the data from last year on lowest standards and current progress monitoring data, and establish weekly formative checks to monitor progress.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

The third action step is to share formative data during Collaborative Team time to ensure data collection/discussion is occurring and that strategies for remediation and enrichment are identified.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Collaborative Team time is monitored weekly throughout the 23-24 school year.

The fourth action step is to implement quarterly data chats with the teacher to review our data compared with other schools and the district. At this time, strategies are reviewed to determine what is working and what is not working. Students who are not mastering standards are identified and a plan for remediation is established.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Data chats will occur quarterly: Week of October 17th Week of January 9th Week of March 25th

#8. 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.

Another area of focus for Lee Virtual Schools includes 7th Grade Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 23-24 school year, Lee Virtual school will increase proficiency in 7th Grade Math from 43% to 50% as measured by the FAST PM 3.

Monitoring:

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

In order to monitor the proficiency of 7th grade math standards, the teacher will use the following monitoring plan:

1. The teacher will analyze PM 1 results to determine target standards to use in whole group instruction and for small group remediation.
2. The teacher will use the PM 1 data to create individual ALEKS paths assigned to students to fill in the gaps. The teacher will set goals with students on the number of topics to be completed each week based on their needs. The teacher will hold students accountable for completing their ALEKS topics weekly.
3. The teacher will share weekly data analysis of formative assessments during Collaborative Team time.
4. Administration of FAST Progress Monitoring ,PM 1 and PM 2, will provide data for the teacher to analyze comparing data to other schools, the district and to the state to identify areas of improvements and areas of progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jenniferm@leeschools.net)

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.)

The teacher will implement thoughtful lesson planning that will include a spiraling review of important standards during every live lesson and will incorporate strategies to increase engagement during the live lessons. The teacher will focus on the Engagement section of Marzano's "The New Art and Science of Teaching" language of instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Engagement section of "The New Art and Science of Teaching" was chosen as research based strategies to ensure that teachers are delivering content to deepen the students' knowledge. These students encourage students to interact with the content in purposeful ways and motivate students to learn.

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 1 - Strong Evidence

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.

The first action step is to discuss current data and set goals with the 7th grade math teacher.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: By August 10, 2023

The second action step is to provide ongoing PD from The New Art and Science of Teaching specifically on the Engagement strategies.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing during monthly PD.

The third action step is for the teacher to create small groups based on data, establish a plan of action for individual student ALEKS paths that follows the remediation path, and establish weekly formative checks to monitor progress.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly ALEKS path completion
Small group intervention walk throughs: Twice a month
Classroom observations: Twice a month

The fourth step is to share formative data during Collaborative Team time to ensure data collection/discussion is occurring.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly Collaborative Team meetings throughout the school year.

The fifth action step is to implement quarterly data chats with the teacher to review our data compared with the district and state. At this time, strategies will be reviewed and remediation and enrichment plans will be adjusted to meet the needs of the students.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: Data chats will occur quarterly: Week of October 17th Week of January 9th Week of March 25th

#9. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation**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.

Another area of focus for Lee Virtual Schools includes graduation rate.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 23-24 school year, Lee Virtual School will increase graduation rate from 97% to 98%.

Monitoring:

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

Through PLCs Grade 11 and 12 will continue to monitor: students below 2.0 GPA, 17 credits or below, Have not met state assessments ELA and Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

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.)

Students who have not met graduation requirements will be scheduled properly to meet end-of-year requirements in their coursework. Students will receive tutoring from senior teachers if falling behind. Students who have not met the reading requirement will be placed in intensive reading and students who have not met the math requirement will receive ACT/SAT prep by a certified teacher. Students will be given every testing opportunity throughout the school year to meet the reading and math requirements.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy is the same strategy used last year to attain a 97% graduation rate.

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.

The first action step is to identify seniors who are missing credits and make sure they are scheduled in the correct classes to graduate at the end of the year. Also, students who have not met the reading, math and GPA requirements are identified and assigned to a specific 12th Grade teacher to monitor engagement and provide remediation in the specific area they need.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

The second action step is to set goals with the 12th Grade Collaborative Team and outline specific action steps for each teacher involved.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jennifermm@leeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

The third step is for the leadership, data, and Collaborative Team to monitor progress towards the goal weekly and provide intervention immediately based on data.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jenniferm@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing weekly throughout the school year.

The fourth action step is to set up in person mandatory parent student conferences with students when they are not making progress towards goals to get student back on track and provide solutions.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McMillan Barnes (jenniferm@leeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing based on weekly monitoring of student progress.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating funding to schools. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student needs. Initially the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, % of ESE students for academic support and for funding purposes. Content tiers are also established to provide instructional support resources based on individual student group needs. Within each school's Title I, SAI, and UniSIG plans as appropriate there is a requirement to address ESSA student groups through high quality instruction and monitoring systems. School funding needs are addressed weekly throughout the school year in collaboration with principal supervisors and the budget department. Ongoing monitoring of student data and underperforming subgroups is provided through monthly visits and data chats by principal supervisors.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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 related 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 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 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based 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

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

N/A

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child’s progress.

List the school’s webpage* where the school’s Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
7	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
8	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
9	III.B.	Area of Focus: Graduation: Graduation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No