
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Pinellas Virtual Franchise

305 4TH AVE SW, Largo, FL 33770

virtualschool.pcsb.org

Demographics

Principal: Mandy Perry

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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)	Economically Disadvantaged Students White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A
	2016-17:
	2015-16:
	2014-15:
	2013-14:
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
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 Pinellas 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

Expanding access for all Pinellas County students to rigorous, relevant curriculum that incorporates skills and knowledge students need to succeed in the 21st century.

Provide the school's vision statement

100% Student Success

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Perry, Mandy	Principal
Principal	

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	1	1	2	1	3	7	10	11	12	16	14	16	94
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	2	2	9
One or more suspensions	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	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	1	1	1	8

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	1	1

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)

479

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/21/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	1	1	4	1	2	2	2	0	1	14

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	73%	70%	61%	81%	65%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	63%	59%	68%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	56%	54%	78%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	70%	72%	62%	69%	69%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	63%	59%	52%	64%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	52%	67%	59%	52%
Science Achievement	59%	64%	56%	69%	62%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	90%	81%	78%	82%	82%	77%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	10 (0)	11 (0)	12 (0)	16 (0)	14 (0)	16 (0)	94 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	1 ()	2 ()	0 ()	2 ()	2 ()	9 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	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 (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)	1 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	8 (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
03	2019	0%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	51%	-51%	54%	-54%
	2018	83%	49%	34%	52%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-83%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
	2018	82%	48%	34%	51%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-82%				
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
08	2019	80%	55%	25%	56%	24%
	2018	85%	55%	30%	58%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
09	2019	73%	54%	19%	55%	18%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		73%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
10	2019	62%	53%	9%	53%	9%
	2018	73%	54%	19%	53%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	64%	-64%	64%	-64%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	60%	-60%	60%	-60%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	44%	-44%	55%	-55%
	2018	60%	45%	15%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-60%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	60%	-60%	54%	-54%
	2018	88%	59%	29%	54%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-88%				
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
08	2019	55%	31%	24%	46%	9%
	2018	59%	31%	28%	45%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	43%	51%	-8%	48%	-5%
	2018	66%	53%	13%	50%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison		43%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	62%	11%	67%	6%
2018	82%	63%	19%	65%	17%
Compare		-9%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	68%	22%	71%	19%
2018	82%	66%	16%	71%	11%
Compare		8%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	87%	70%	17%	70%	17%
2018	81%	70%	11%	68%	13%
Compare		6%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	55%	30%	61%	24%
2018	69%	57%	12%	62%	7%
Compare		16%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	56%	19%	57%	18%
2018	65%	56%	9%	56%	9%
Compare		10%			

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	75	58		69	60		63	90	60		
FRL	79	50		67	64			91			

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
HSP	90	60									
WHT	83	73	83	73	53		68	83	50		
FRL	91										

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	66
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	526
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
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

Asian Students	
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 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	68
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	70
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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

Our current level of performance of grade 6 math is 33%, as evidenced in school-wide FSA testing. This was a decrease of 27%. This has been a decreasing trend for the past 3 years. The problem/gap is occurring because of progress monitoring of student's skills.

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

Grade 8 science, Biology, Grade 6 and Grade 10 ELA showed the largest decline. This has been a 3-year trend in Grade 8 Science only. The problem/gap is occurring because of progress monitoring of student's skills.

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

Grade 6 math had the greatest gap compared to the state.

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

Algebra and Civics showed the most improvement. There was an increase in this area because there was an increase of progress monitoring of student's skills.

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

The areas of concern would be the state tests went from a 73% passing rate to 71%.

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

1. Middle School Math
2. Science
3. Middle and High school ELA
4. Graduation Rate
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	If we effectively implement high-leverage strategies which support standards-based instruction , then the percent of all students succeeding on state testing will increase from 71% to 76%.
Rationale	This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed and this Area of Focus impacts student learning and success in all the areas where there was a decrease in performance.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving mathematics proficiency in grade 6 will increase from 33% to 43%, as measured by FSA tests. The percent of all students achieving proficiency in Grade 8 Science and Biology will increase from 58% to 68% as measured by FCAT and EOC tests. The percent of all students achieving proficiency in Grade 6 and Grade 10 ELA will increase from 69% to 75%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. Strengthen staff practice to utilize questions to help students elaborate on content.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To make sure that staff is fully trained to help students in complex tasks. These strategies will increase opportunities for teachers to productively collaborate in analyzing student data and planning lessons to interact with new content or deepen the understanding of the content. Evidence of this completion will be found in the minutes of the PLC's and through Live lessons.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Learning on how to engage students in complex tasks in math, science, and ELA. 2. Professional Learning on incorporating Data and DBA chats in math, science, and ELA 3. Professional Learning on face to face tutoring and progress monitoring in math, science, and ELA. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	If we effectively implement high-leverage strategies which support studentcentered with rigor, then the percent of all students success in all classes will increase from 71% to 76%.
Rationale	Grade 8 science, Biology, Grade 6 and Grade 10 ELA showed the largest decline. This has been a 3-year trend in Grade 8 Science only. The problem/gap is occurring because of progress monitoring of student's skills.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percent of all students achieving mathematics proficiency in grade 6 will increase from 33% to 43%, as measured by FSA tests. The percent of all students achieving proficiency in Grade 8 Science and Biology will increase from 58% to 68% as measured by FCAT and EOC tests. The percent of all students achieving proficiency in Grade 6 and Grade 10 ELA will increase from 69% to 75%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. Strengthen staff practice to utilize questions to help students elaborate on content. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To make sure that staff is fully trained to help students in complex tasks. These strategies will increase opportunities for teachers to productively collaborate in analyzing student data and planning lessons to interact with new content or deepen the understanding of the content. Evidence of this completion will be found in the minutes of the PLC's and through Live lessons.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Learning on how to engage students in complex tasks in math, science, and ELA. 2. Professional Learning on incorporating Data and DBA chats in math, science, and ELA. 3. Professional Learning on face to face tutoring and progress monitoring in math, science, and ELA. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org)

#3	
Title	The percent of all students graduating on-time with their cohort will increase from 79% to 84%, as measured by the district's final graduation file.
Rationale	The problem/gap is occurring because this will be the second year to have a graduation.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	1. Our current level of performance is 79%, as evidenced by our graduation rate. 2. We expect our performance level to be 80% by June 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Intensify graduation committee focus on data to plan interventions and supports for individual students. 2. Strengthen staff practice to communicate and engage students and families in planning when students are not on track to graduate. 3. Strengthen staff ability to engage students for on-track promotion throughout high school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This will be only the second year we will have graduation at our school. Since our current level of graduation was 79% this year, more focus will be needed on strengthening plans for intervention and support for our upcoming cohorts. These strategies will increase opportunities for teachers to productively collaborate in analyzing student data and planning lessons to interact with new content or deepen the understanding of the content. Students will be taught how to monitor their success of completion. Evidence will be found in the minutes of the PLC's and the SBLT and next year's graduation rate.
Action Step	
Description	1. Graduation Committee will be formed. 2. Strategies will be discussed from above and sub-committees formed to implement planned interventions. 3. On-track progress monitoring is implemented by all teachers. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Mandy Perry (perrym@pcsb.org)

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)

N/A

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

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

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

N/A

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

PVS is a K-12 school so the strategies are built into the system. PVS supports student transitioning from one school level to the next through orientations and teacher looping.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

School leadership ensures that all staff members have high expectations for success of all students through monthly staff meetings, quarterly observations, use of mentors, creation, and monitoring of student success plans, and spot checks in Learning Management Systems to determine that courses align with standards, district expectations, and accreditation requirements. The School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) will be responsible for managing and coordinating efforts between all school teams as well as reviewing the School Improvement Plan. The School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) plays a role in assisting all staff in developing positive and appropriate interventions to assist all students. The team will continue to focus on helping economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and other struggling students to improve their academic success, both within the classroom and on standardized tests. Monitoring data will be done through the data of FSA, Write Score, Performance Matters, and formative assessments. Data will be used to address the effectiveness within the classroom's Common Core instruction. Core instruction will be monitored by the MTSS team and action plans will be created during department PLC meetings to ensure ongoing positive instruction in the classroom is being met.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

Pinellas Virtual School's counselor meets with individual students to discuss curriculum selections that align to college and career awareness based on the individual students' interest and desires. Many students participate in early college and dual enrollment with St.

Petersburg College. The master schedule is built based on the needs of its student population. PVS has implemented the AVID program in all secondary grade levels. AVID focuses on students that may not have considered college as an option.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

N/A

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A	Areas of Focus: If we effectively implement high-leverage strategies which support standards-based instruction , then the percent of all students succeeding on state testing will increase from 71% to 76%.	\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: If we effectively implement high-leverage strategies which support studentcentered with rigor, then the percent of all students success in all classes will increase from 71% to 76%.	\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: The percent of all students graduating on-time with their cohort will increase from 79% to 84%, as measured by the district's final graduation file.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00