

Leon County Schools

Leon County Virtual School Franchise



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	15

Leon County Virtual School Franchise

860 BLOUNTSTOWN ST, Tallahassee, FL 32304

<http://www.leongoesvirtual.net>

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Lowe

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	24%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14:
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Leon County Virtual School's mission is to foster a virtual learning environment that meets the needs of the individual family while upholding academic integrity and promoting instructional innovation.

Provide the school's vision statement

Mirrors Leon County Schools vision statement
 Leon County Virtual School will be an engaging, safe, and respectful learning environment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lowe, Jessica	Principal	
Crowley, Ashley	Dean	
Bishop, Ken	Teacher, K-12	
Graves, Kelvin	Teacher, K-12	
Anderson, Jan	Guidance Counselor	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/22/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	91%	57%	56%	100%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	75%	52%	51%	67%	52%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	40%	42%	0%	37%	44%
Math Achievement	76%	56%	51%	83%	52%	51%
Math Learning Gains	71%	47%	48%	60%	42%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	47%	45%	0%	42%	45%
Science Achievement	90%	67%	68%	0%	64%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	82%	73%	0%	77%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
06	2019	0%	54%	-54%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	51%	-51%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	59%	-59%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	58%	-58%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	77%	57%	20%	53%	24%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		77%				
Cohort Comparison		77%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	53%	-53%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	45%	-45%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	0%	44%	-44%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	82%	70%	12%	67%	15%
2018	0%	69%	-69%	65%	-65%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		82%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	75%	-75%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	73%	-73%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	81%	-81%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	79%	-79%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	69%	-69%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	71%	-71%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	67%	-67%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
WHT	88	79		90						100	50

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
WHT	100									100	40

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	547
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	81
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The lowest performance area for the 2018-19 school year was math learning gains at 71% However, LCVS scored higher in this area than the district at 47% and state at 48%.

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

There was only one area that showed a decline. This area was ELA achievement which went from 100% in 2017-18 to 91% in 2018-19. This is much higher than the district ELA achievement at 57% and the state at 56%.

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

LCVS outperformed the state in all achievement areas.

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

Math learning gains rose by 11%.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

There was a drop in ELA achievement which went from 100% in 2017-18 to 91% in 2018-19. However, this is much higher than the district ELA achievement at 57% and the state at 56%.

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. Math Achievement
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	English Language Arts
Rationale	In adherence to LCVS' vision and mission of academic excellence, it is imperative to continuously improve and exceed statewide student performance results.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	As we continue a more complex state measure of performance in English/Language Arts, our school goal is for at least 66% of our students to score at or above the proficiency level on the ELA section of the spring 2020 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Lowe (lowej@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	LCVS will provide targeted face-to-face tutoring to all students based on progress monitoring assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This is the strategy that best fits our student population.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student progress will be discussed monthly by the leadership team and lead instructors as a part of the Lead Teacher Intervention Meetings. (LTI) 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Jessica Lowe (lowej@leonschools.net)

#2	
Title	College and Career Acceleration
Rationale	In adherence to LCVS' vision and mission of academic excellence, it is imperative to continuously improve and exceed statewide student performance results.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	At least 45% of our students will participate in College and Career Acceleration Coursework with successful completions resulting in credit earned. Successful completion is defined as follows: College credit earned through AP exams, IB exams, or dual enrollment courses, or CAPE industry certification earned through successful completion of industry certification examinations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Lowe (lowej@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students will be advised on all acceleration options and opportunities for CAPE industry certification earned through successful completion of industry certification examinations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This is the strategy that best meets the needs of our student population.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will have individual advising appointments with the guidance counselor. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Jessica Lowe (lowej@leonschools.net)

#3	
Title	Mathematics
Rationale	In adherence to LCVS' vision and mission of academic excellence, it is imperative to continuously improve and exceed statewide student performance results.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	As we continue a more complex state measure of performance in mathematics, our school goal is for at least 63% of our students to score at or above the proficiency level on the mathematics section of the spring 2020 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	LCVS will provide targeted face-to-face tutoring to all students based on progress monitoring assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This is the strategy that best fits our student population.

Action Step	
Description	1. Student progress will be discussed monthly by the leadership team and lead instructors as a part of the Lead Teacher Intervention Meetings. (LTI) 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Jessica Lowe (lowej@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: English Language Arts				\$1,669.65
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	510-Supplies	7004 - Leon County Virtual School Franchise	School Improvement Funds		\$1,669.65
			<i>Notes: Earbuds Student Supplies ACT Aspire</i>			
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: College and Career Acceleration				\$90.68

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
	5100	510-Supplies	7004 - Leon County Virtual School Franchise	School Improvement Funds		\$90.68	
			<i>Notes: AP Prep</i>				
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Mathematics					\$452.45
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
	5100	510-Supplies	7004 - Leon County Virtual School Franchise	School Improvement Funds		\$452.45	
			<i>Notes: EOC Prep</i>				
					Total:	\$2,212.78	