Volusia Online Learning Flvs (Franchise) School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Volusia Online Learning Flvs (Franchise)

250 ENTERPRISE RD, Deltona, FL 32725

http://volusiaonlinelearning.com/site/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Volusia County School Board on 10/31/2023.

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.

Volusia County Schools will ignite a passion for learning in all students to be productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Create life-long learners prepared for an ever-changing 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
Serianni, Anthony	Principal	Supervise faculty and staff; ensure implementation of curriculum and school improvement efforts.
Shaw, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Full-time Assistant Principal Curriculum and Instruction Data Analysis Progress Monitoring Communication
Cook-Grant, Tiffanee	Assistant Principal	Full-time Assistant Principal Curriculum and Instruction Data Analysis Progress Monitoring Communication
Chapple, Christa	Other	Professional Development and Curriculum
Ervin, Amy	Curriculum Resource Teacher	School Resource Teacher responsible for FLVS VSA enrollments, classroom assignments, and teacher support and professional development.
Larson, Chanda	Other	Teacher on Assignment
Horn, Stacey	SAC Member	Coordinate and direct monthly SAC meeting and compile/present data for SIP.

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.

This schoolwide improvement plan was developed through a partnership between the school leadership team and the school advisory council, which includes teachers, staff, community members, parents, and students. The school leadership team developed the plan using school data and research-based strategies and presented the plan to SAC for discussion, suggestions, and ultimately, approval.

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 throughout the school year during quarterly data meetings called Stocktake. During these data meetings, school leadership will analyze the effectiveness of improvement efforts by tracking measurable indicators and adjusting the plan as needed throughout the school year.

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	40%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	14%
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: B

	2019-20: B
	2018-19: 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	1	1	3	6	6	6	8	7	14	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	6	7	17
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	6	18
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	12	35
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	2	0	2	4	6	9	23

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	4	6	5	9	12	16	1	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	6	6	4	3	1	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	16	29	5	6	4	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	7

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	6	7	6	1	0	1	23

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	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	4	6	5	9	12	16	1	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	6	6	4	3	1	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	16	29	5	6	4	76
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	7

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	6	7	6	1	0	1	21

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	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*	63	48	53	65	49	55			
ELA Learning Gains				63					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54					
Math Achievement*	52	45	55	42	32	42			
Math Learning Gains				52					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				27					
Science Achievement*	55	56	52	57	45	54			
Social Studies Achievement*	68	64	68	72	52	59			
Middle School Acceleration	41	53	70	69	44	51			
Graduation Rate		76	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		43	53		62	70			
ELP Progress		58	55		68	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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	358
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	93
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	501
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	86
Graduation Rate	

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	39	Yes	2	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	46			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	65			

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%
FRL	64			

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	28	Yes	1	1
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	54			
HSP	51			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	62			
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	63			52			55	68	41			
SWD	34			25			29	69			4	
ELL	53			39							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	65			42			38	57			4	
HSP	50			43			44	45			4	
MUL	79			57							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	66			57			62	80	40		6	
FRL	76			44			65	69			4	

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	65	63	54	42	52	27	57	72	69			
SWD	22	25		19	45							
ELL	63			50								
AMI												
ASN	73			75								
BLK	64	59		33	41		72					
HSP	67	76		40	50	30	44					
MUL	50			47								
PAC												
WHT	77	58	36	50	59		64	88				
FRL	67	57	50	44	39	20	59					

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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	63%	45%	18%	50%	13%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	53%	13%	54%	12%
07	2023 - Spring	68%	44%	24%	47%	21%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	39%	21%	47%	13%
09	2023 - Spring	53%	44%	9%	48%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	57%	13%	58%	12%
06	2023 - Spring	61%	42%	19%	47%	14%
03	2023 - Spring	76%	53%	23%	50%	26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	55%	49%	6%	54%	1%
07	2023 - Spring	66%	44%	22%	48%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	76%	57%	19%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	59%	-4%	61%	-6%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	37%	16%	55%	-2%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	55%	-10%	55%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	45%	47%	-2%	44%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	61%	1%	51%	11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	37%	32%	5%	50%	-13%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	32%	39%	-7%	48%	-16%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	65%	3%	63%	5%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	65%	-1%	66%	-2%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	57%	6%	63%	0%

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.

45% of our students scored a level 3 or higher on the Math PM3 assessment compared to 55% VCS and Statewide. Factors that contributed to this year's low performance included larger class sizes, new benchmarks, new assessment, and lack of time on task within the virtual class. Although, below the state/VCS, the data shows an increase over the previous year with many students increasing in achievement level.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was social studies achievement falling from 92% to 63% at level 3 or above. Factors that contributed to this decline include a shift in student population from the 2021-22 school year to the 2022-23 school year (in 2021-22, only select full-time VOL students took FLVS courses; in 2022-23, all full-time VOL students took FLVS courses), and the fact that the 2021-22 scores did not include US History EOC scores (Civics EOC scores). While this was a steep decline as a school our schools scores for Social Studies achievement is comparable to the district.

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.

45% of our students scored a level 3 or higher on the Math PM3 assessment compared to 55% VCS and Statewide. Factors that contributed to this year's low performance included larger class sizes, new benchmarks, new assessment and lack of time on task within the virtual class. Although, below the state/VCS, the data shows an increase over the previous year with many students increasing in achievement level.

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

The data component with the most improvement is Math. Last year's SIP focused on improving mathematics scores with a focus on note taking, teacher clarity, engagement, and feedback. Of those four strategies, we found note-taking was fully embraced. We made strides in teacher clarity, engagement strategies, and creating feedback loops, but continue to see those strategies as both paths to improved math scores and areas of growth, especially since our math data continues to be below the state and district levels despite our growth.

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

Two potential areas of concern are Level 1 on statewide assessment in Math and Level 1 on statewide assessment in ELA.

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

1. Percentage of students scoring a level 3 or higher in all mathematics assessments
2. Systems to support student learning in reading and mathematics
3. Systems to support students with disabilities in reading and mathematics
4. School Culture and Climate

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.

Although student mathematics outcomes increased from the 2021-2022 school year to the 2022-2023 school year, the percentage of students who scored a level 3 or above on the FAST mathematics was below the state and district percentages in most grade levels. We made significant gains from the previous year but have not yet met our goals. We therefore would like to continue our improvement efforts from last school year.

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

Our student outcome goal for this area of focus is to increase the percent level 3 or higher goals per grade level/subject area as listed below:
-3rd - from 76% to 81%
-4th - from 55% to 60%
-5th - from 45% to 50%
-6th - from 55% to 60%
-7th - from 66% to 71%
-8th - from 53% to 48%
-Algebra 1 - from 52% to 57%
-Geometry - from 35% to 40%

Furthermore, with coaching support, our goal is that by May, 2024, 90% of our FLVS math teachers will provide instruction that is high in teacher clarity and utilizes collaborative structures and specific questioning strategies to promote student engagement, as evidenced in walkthroughs.

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

Teachers will monitor students' understanding during tutoring, live lessons, and DBAs. Teachers will ensure academic integrity. In addition, teachers will monitor students' progress, pacing, and grade on a weekly basis.

The administration will monitor teacher clarity, use of standards-based instruction and tasks, questioning strategies, and engagement strategies through walkthroughs. Evidence of strategy/intervention implementation will be gathered and assessed using a walkthrough instrument.

Effectiveness and impact of the strategies will be monitored through monthly data meetings and quarterly StockTake meetings. Impact on student outcomes will be evaluated using student data on the FAST test and other progress monitoring tools (i.e.: math nation, iXL, etc.). Impact on teacher practice will be evaluated using data collected with the walkthrough instrument. Improvement of coaching practice will be measured by tracking the impact of teacher practice and student outcomes on target teachers assigned to coaches.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.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. Teacher Clarity - We plan on utilizing both the BEST standards and the FLVS quality audit standards to ensure that the intentions of the lesson/unit are clearly communicated, as are the expectation of the benchmark and success criteria. (per Hattie, d = 0.76)

2. Engagement - We plan on using several engagement strategies to elicit active student participation. We will deliberately engage students in self-learning (d = 1.20), scaffold instruction in order to engage students with appropriate content (d = 0.82), and utilize collaborative structures (d = 0.62, per Kagan)

3. Feedback - We plan on promoting systematic and planned channels from student to teacher designed to demonstrate understanding and from teacher to student designed to refine and enhance teaching and learning through the use of questioning strategies. (Average effect size of d = 0.48, per Hattie).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Last school year, VOL math teachers worked on improving teacher clarity within live lessons, increasing student engagement through planned events during live lessons, and establish feedback loops in order to improve student understanding. This effort proved successful in that scores increased, but not to the desired extent. A more focused approach will be implemented this year. For Teacher Clarity, we will implement the FLVS quality audit standards to ensure effective communication of expectations, lesson intent, and pacing expectations. For engagement, we will focus on training teachers using specific collaborative structures (e.g.: Kagan structures) and the use of digital tools that promote collaboration (e.g.: Nearpod, Jamboard, etc.). For feedback, we will focus on training teachers on questioning strategies.

The thought is that a more focused curriculum is more likely to produced the desired impact.

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.

Review prior year data with subject-area/grade level PLCs.

Person Responsible: Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 31, 2023

Facilitate professional learning and collaborative planning on evidence-based strategies during PLCs, rotational reporting days, and ERPLs.

Person Responsible: Christa Chapple (cechappl@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly, by April, 2024

Implementation of strategies will be monitored through walkthroughs and the use of an instrument designed to gauge the implementation of teacher clarity strategies, collaborative structures, and feedback/questioning strategies.

Person Responsible: Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly, by April, 2024

Weekly PLCs in which teachers collaborate to design lessons and tasks based on the B.E.S.T standards while focusing on teacher clarity, pacing, and student engagement, as well as determining the effectiveness of implementation.

Person Responsible: Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly, by April, 2024

Monthly data meetings with teachers to analyze student progress and performance.

Person Responsible: Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly, by April, 2024

Walkthrough and teacher data meetings will be used to identify teachers in need of support. Identified teachers will be provided with instructional coaching and training based.

Person Responsible: Christa Chapple (cechappl@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly, by April, 2024

Administration and teachers will identify students in need of additional academic or behavior supports and work to design and implement appropriate interventions

Person Responsible: Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly, by April, 2024

Administration will monitor impact of strategies through quarterly StockTake meetings to review data and adjust strategies.

Person Responsible: Melissa Shaw (msshaw@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly, by April 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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.

VOL student performance on the 2023 FAST assessments indicated a decrease in reading achievement (which remains above state and district averages) and an increase in math achievement (which is largely below state and district averages). The inconsistent results from the last two years of state assessment can be attributed to a population shift. Prior to the 2022-2023 school year, only select VOL students took FLVS courses and were members of 7004. Beginning 2022-2023, all full-time VOL students who are seeking a standard diploma took FLVS-based courses and were housed in 7004. As a result of this shift, the population of test-takers became more diverse and requires a more comprehensive instructional system. The focus this year is to implement Systematic Instruction within an MTSS framework schoolwide. This system will provide VOL teachers with a prescribed plan to diagnose and treat student needs is needed to ensure thorough instruction and intervention.

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

As a result of the implementation of systematic instruction within an MTSS framework, Learning gains in all areas will increase 10% from the previous year's percentage.

Reading LG overall - from 63% to 69%
Reading LG low 25% - from 54% to 50%
Math LG overall - from 52% to 57%
Math LG low 25% - from 27% to 50% (exceeds the 10% increase goal)

With coaching support, our goal is that by May, 2024, 90% of FLVS teachers will provide systematic instruction that includes direct instruction, feedback loops, and targeted interventions, as evidenced through data collected in walkthroughs and monthly data meetings.

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

Teachers will monitor students' understanding during one-on-one tutoring, live lessons, class assignments, and DBAs. Teachers will use the results of monitoring as the basis for in-class instructional support and reteaching through targeted small group sessions. Teachers will monitor student engagement using participation in live-lesson and response to communication. In addition, teachers will monitor students' progress, pacing, and grade on a weekly basis.

The administration will monitor teacher implementation of systematic instruction and fidelity to the MTSS process through walkthroughs and monthly data meetings.

Effectiveness and impact of the strategies will be monitored through quarterly StockTake meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.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.)

Systematic instruction is explicit, purposeful, data-driven, and takes into account all aspects of teaching and learning. MTSS is a framework that helps a school articulate it's system for providing instruction, intervention, and support for students based on their level of need. As such, these general systems for

teaching and intervention can encompass a wide range of specific instructional strategies. At VOL, our systematic instruction will focus on direct instruction (effect size of d = 0.82, per Hattie), utilizing feedback loops (d = 0.73, per Hattie), providing targeted intervention (d = 0.77, per Hattie), and adjusting based on a student's response to intervention (d = 1.02, per Hattie).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

VOL teachers typically see students in whole group once a week for all core subject areas, therefore direct instruction is an appropriate strategy given the relative small amount of time with students in whole group. Establishing feedback loops helps teachers effectively identify student needs and whether or not a student needs a targeted intervention beyond feedback. Targeted intervention is a data-based strategy that will allow the teacher to work with individual or small groups of students to reteach or intervene with precision while also allowing the teacher to evaluate the students' response to the intervention and adjust if needed. All of these strategies are feasible for virtual learning and promote precise, efficient instruction and intervention.

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.

Review prior year data with subject-area/grade level PLCs.

Person Responsible: Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023

Establish weekly PLCs in which teachers collaborate to design lessons and tasks based on the B.E.S.T standards while focusing on direct instruction, feedback loops, and interventions.

Person Responsible: Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly until April 2024

Facilitate training on evidence-based strategies during PLCs, rotational reporting days, and ERPLs.

Person Responsible: Christa Chapple (cechappl@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing until April 2024

Monitor implementation of strategies through walkthroughs

Person Responsible: Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing until March 2024

Monitor progress and effectiveness of interventions during monthly data meetings individual teachers

Person Responsible: Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly until April 2024

Administration will identify teachers in need of support and will provide additional instructional coaching and training based on monthly data meetings

Person Responsible: Christa Chapple (cechappl@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly until April 2024

Administration and teachers will identify students in need of additional academic or behavior supports and work to design and implement appropriate interventions

Person Responsible: Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly until April 2024

Administration will monitor impact of strategies through quarterly StockTake meetings to review data and adjust strategies.

Person Responsible: Melissa Shaw (msshaw@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly until April 2024

#3. 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.

Students with disabilities had a federal index below 41% for the 2021-2022 school year (28%). All other subgroups and the school as a whole were well above 41%, indicating a need to focus on how we serve our students with disabilities.

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

Our goal for the 2023-2024 school year is for our students with disabilities to perform at or above the federal index minimum threshold of 41% (combined overall performance across as school grade components of 41% or higher).

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

Students with disabilities will be monitored in a number of ways:
* teachers will monitor student progress and performance and communicate with parents and administration on a weekly basis
* ESE teachers will submit bi-monthly progress reports on student progress towards IEP goals to parents and admin
* Monthly teacher data meetings will include a specific tracking of SWDs and their progress and performance within a course in order to identify the need for additional intervention

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.)

VOL utilizes Systematic Instruction along with the MTSS framework in order to teach, reteach, identify students in need of intervention, design and implement interventions, and then evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention. Interventions provided to SWDs include reteaching in small group, 1:1 tutoring based on in-class performance or assessment, direct and frequent communication, and IEP-based accommodations. While these interventions are available to all students, SWDs are supported by a team of teachers consisting of the classroom teacher, their assigned ESE case manager, and a subject-area specialist ESE teacher for each of the core subjects.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SWDs often require additional and more intense supports to achieve equitable outcomes. The chosen strategies are proven effective for all students and increasing the frequency, precision, and fidelity of the interventions is likely to prove effective for our SWDs.

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.

Review prior year SWD data with subject-area/grade level PLCs.

Person Responsible: Tiffanee Cook-Grant (ttcookgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: September, 2023

Facilitate training on evidence-based strategies during PLCs, rotational reporting days, and ERPLs.

Person Responsible: Christa Chapple (cechappl@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing, by April 2024

Monitor progress of SWDs during monthly data meetings with individual teachers

Person Responsible: Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly, by April 2024

Monitor progress and effectiveness of interventions for SWD during monthly data meetings with ESE case managers

Person Responsible: Tiffanee Cook-Grant (ttcookgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly, by April 2024

Monitor implementation of strategies through walkthroughs

Person Responsible: Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing, by March, 2024

Administration will identify teachers in need of support and will provide additional instructional coaching and training based on monthly data meetings

Person Responsible: Christa Chapple (cechappl@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly, by April 2024

Administration and teachers will identify students in need of additional academic or behavior supports and work to design and implement appropriate interventions

Person Responsible: Tiffanee Cook-Grant (ttcookgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly, by April 2024

Administration will monitor impact of strategies through quarterly StockTake meetings to review data and adjust strategies.

Person Responsible: Melissa Shaw (msshaw@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly, by April 2024

#4. 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.

Volusia Online Learning strives to build a positive school culture and involve all stakeholders. Our goal is to utilize consistent and clear communication, and create opportunities for collaboration and education in order to engage our stakeholders in the education of our students.

We have seen an increase in indicators of a positive culture, such as percent tested and live lesson attendance, increase with our efforts from last year. We plan to continue those efforts to establish and maintain positive relationships between all stakeholders at VOL through communication and opportunities for student/parent involvement this upcoming school year.

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

As a result of our efforts to promote a positive culture and environment, VOL would like to increase our percent tested from 92% to 95%. Furthermore, we would like to see an increase in live lesson attendance such that 75% of all core live lessons are attended on a weekly basis.

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

Effectiveness and impact of the strategies will be monitored through monthly data meetings and quarterly StockTake meetings. Outcomes will be measured using the percent tested for each individual FAST test window (percent tested) and teacher surveys (live lesson attendance).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.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.)

VOL utilizes Epstein's framework for the 6 Types of Involvement for School-Family-Community Partnerships. While this framework does not constitute an intervention unto itself, it does give our faculty and staff tangible steps by which we can develop relationships with our families and community. Furthermore, the framework suggests interventions in its description of each type of involvement (i.e.: in order to promote collaboration with the community, identify and integrate existing community resources and services to bolster school programs). These suggestions align with the VOL's primary focus and strategies to building a positive school culture, such as consistently and clearly communicating student progress, course expectations, and available school resources; creating meaningful student involvement opportunities such as meet-ups, field trips, fieldwork, and SAC, among others; school newsletter to ensure all stakeholders are informed and to celebrate our successes; and culture-building activities (i.e.: team-building trips, staff shirts, incentives, etc.) to boost morale.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

While this framework does not constitute an intervention unto itself, it is well-established in the research and give our faculty and staff tangible steps by which we can develop relationships with our families and community. Furthermore, there is an abundance of literature that has utilized this framework to detail successful interventions and strategies to move relationships from one end of the continuum to the other.

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.

Facilitate training on Epstein's framework and suggested strategies for engagement during PLCs, rotational reporting days, and ERPLs.

Person Responsible: Christa Chapple (cechappl@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing until April 2024

Develop teacher survey to record and track live lesson attendance.

Person Responsible: Amy Ervin (aservin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023

Monitor student assessment participation during FAST testing

Person Responsible: Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023/January 2024

Administration, teacher leaders, and SAC collaborate to develop a schedule of events that meets the needs of the school and its stakeholders

Person Responsible: Stacey Horn (slhorn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 2023

Administrators monitor individual and systematic teacher communication during monthly data meetings

Person Responsible: Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly until April 2024

Administration develop system for mass communication with stakeholders, including a newsletter, connectEd messages, website, social media, etc.

Person Responsible: Anthony Serianni (aaserian@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing until April 2024

Administration will monitor impact of strategies through quarterly StockTake meetings to review data and adjust strategies.

Person Responsible: Melissa Shaw (msshaw@volusia.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly until April 2024

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).

Requests for school improvement funds must be made at the monthly School Advisory Council (SAC) meeting and be accompanied by a presentation explaining to the council how the funds would be used, how that use aligns with the schoolwide improvement plan, and detailed estimate of expenditures. Provided a quorum is present, the members of SAC would then be asked to vote on the request with a majority vote needed to approve the expense.