St. Johns Virtual Franchise

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

St. Johns Virtual Franchise

2980 COLLINS AVE, St Augustine, FL 32084

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Nigel Pillay

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

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.

Our mission is to ensure all students are provided with an academically rich and rigorous education through online learning opportunities that meet the needs of today's diverse learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of St. Johns Virtual School is to be leaders in innovative teaching through online and blended learning programs that use best practices to promote academic excellence and life long learning in a student-centered environment.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Erskine, Ryan	Assistant Principal	.serves as the district liaison for virtual and blended instruction as well as credit recovery. Monitors student progress and communicates with stakeholders.
Scott, Melissa	Guidance Counselor	Counselor - meets with families and students to discuss expectations, review applications, and monitor student progress.
McCullough, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher - provides instructional support to teachers.
Livingood, Lindsay	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher - provides instructional support to teachers.
Sikes, Christine	Teacher, K-12	Teacher grades 6-12/SAC Chair - coordinates stakeholders and brings topics to the SAC team meetings.
Pillay, Nigel	Principal	Oversee daily operations of SJVS

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Nigel Pillay

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
43

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/21/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	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	
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	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	

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	
Students retained two or more times	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	
Number of students enrolled	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	
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	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	

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	
Students retained two or more times	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	92%	74%	56%	90%	73%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	60%	51%	63%	59%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	76%	50%	42%	91%	50%	41%
Math Achievement	87%	73%	51%	86%	69%	49%
Math Learning Gains	61%	58%	48%	58%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	55%	45%	63%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	81%	86%	68%	76%	84%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	97%	88%	73%	90%	86%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**							**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	80%	74%	6%	54%	26%
	2018	89%	71%	18%	52%	37%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	95%	72%	23%	52%	43%
	2018	93%	70%	23%	51%	42%
Same Grade Comparison	2%					
Cohort Comparison	6%					
08	2019	78%	71%	7%	56%	22%
	2018	100%	76%	24%	58%	42%
Same Grade Comparison	-22%					
Cohort Comparison	-15%					
09	2019	93%	75%	18%	55%	38%
	2018	100%	74%	26%	53%	47%
Same Grade Comparison	-7%					
Cohort Comparison	-7%					
10	2019	100%	74%	26%	53%	47%
	2018	100%	76%	24%	53%	47%
Same Grade Comparison	0%					
Cohort Comparison	0%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	90%	74%	16%	55%	35%
	2018	83%	73%	10%	52%	31%
Same Grade Comparison	7%					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	94%	80%	14%	54%	40%
	2018	83%	80%	3%	54%	29%
Same Grade Comparison	11%					
Cohort Comparison	11%					
08	2019	75%	78%	-3%	46%	29%
	2018	88%	73%	15%	45%	43%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	78%	72%	6%	48%	30%
	2018	88%	75%	13%	50%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	87%	-2%	67%	18%
2018	92%	84%	8%	65%	27%
Compare		-7%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	90%	10%	71%	29%
2018	100%	89%	11%	71%	29%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	88%	7%	70%	25%
2018	100%	87%	13%	68%	32%
Compare		-5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	79%	6%	61%	24%
2018	92%	79%	13%	62%	30%
Compare		-7%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	81%	9%	57%	33%
2018	85%	77%	8%	56%	29%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		5%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
WHT	93	66	79	88	60		84	97	33	95	45

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
WHT	98	73	91	84	60		89	100		84	19

2017 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	89	61		82	58	58	82	88		80	65

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	72
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	796
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%

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 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	74
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 Math Learning Gains performed the lowest at 61% of students making learning gains in math. Yes, it is a trend that continues.

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

The Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed the greatest decline from the prior year. SJVS went from 82% to a 69%.

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

The data component with the biggest gap was Math and ELA achievement. The state average for ELA achievement was 56% and 51% for math. SJVS had a average of 92% for ELA achievement and 87% for Math. The area in which we were the closest to the state average was Science. SJVS scored 81% in Science achievement, 13% higher than the state.

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

Math Learning Gains showed the most improvement from 57% to 61%. Although SJVS is primarily a virtual program, math teachers provided more face to face learning opportunities on campus for math students as well as more lessons online to interact with the teacher and other students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Not applicable

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

1. Social-emotional learning for students who are new to a virtual learning platform
2. Math Learning Gains
3. ELA Learning Gains
4. Providing socialization and Character Counts opportunities for SJVS students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data, 76% of SJVS's lowest quartile students made ELA learning gains in 2019. Compared to other data components, this number is lower and follows a patter or lower ELA learning gains in previous years. Working to increase ELA learning gains will have a positive impact on student success.
Measurable Outcome:	The outcome is to increase ELA learning gains of 85% or more of the students in the lowest quartile for the 2020-21 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ryan Erskine (ryan.erskine@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SJVS teachers will use Professional Learning Communities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SJVS teachers will participate in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) both in content area groups and in grade level groups to increase levels of expertise in teaching in an online environment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will meet at least twice a month in PLC groups.
2. Teachers will collaborate to target the needs of students in the lowest 25% of ELA scores as determined by FSA.
3. Teachers will utilize direct instruction time in the online classroom (Zoom) to work with struggling students.
4. Students who are struggling will also receive 1:1 instruction during bi-monthly Academic days.

Person Responsible	Ryan Erskine (ryan.erskine@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data, 69% of SJVS's lowest quartile students made math learning gains in 2019. Compared to other data components, this number is lower and follows a patter or lower math learning gains in previous years. Working to increase math learning gains will have a positive impact on student success.
Measurable Outcome:	The outcome is to increase math learning gains of 85% or more of the students in the lowest quartile for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ryan Erskine (ryan.erskine@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SJVS teachers will use Professional Learning Communities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SJVS teachers will participate in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) both in content area groups and in grade level groups to increase levels of expertise in teaching in an online environment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will meet at least twice a month in PLC groups.
2. Teachers will collaborate to target the needs of students in the lowest 25% of math scores as determined by FSA.
3. Teachers will utilize direct instruction time in the online classroom (Zoom) struggling students.
4. Students who are struggling will also receive 1:1 instruction during bi-monthly Academic days.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Providing more socialization/learning opportunities for students has been a concern and topic at our SAC meetings in previous years. At all grade levels, incorporating the Character Counts pillars is something our school wants to focus on.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome is to continue quarterly homeroom meetings for all full-time SJVS students. These online meetings will allow students to interact and build relationships with each other and their teachers. Goals for these meetings include: Goal 1 - Develop self-awareness and self-management skills to achieve school and life success. Goal 2 - Use social-awareness and interpersonal skills to establish and maintain positive relationships. Goal 3 - Demonstrate decision-making skills and responsible behaviors in personal, school, and community contexts. Students will have the opportunity to participate in online Academic Days to increase interactions, and provide a means to check on students' academic and social-emotional progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ryan Erskine (ryan.erskine@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Full-time SJVS students will participate in the quarterly homeroom meetings via the online classroom (Zoom).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By participating in quarterly homerooms with their peers, students will feel more connected to their teachers and to their classmates

Action Steps to Implement

Each full-time teacher will be assigned a homeroom of students at one of the grade levels for which they provide instruction. Teachers will work together to design quarterly meetings that engage students in social-emotional learning opportunities and celebrate student success by focusing on the Character Counts pillars.

Person Responsible	Ryan Erskine (ryan.erskine@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

NA

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

SJVS continually works at building a positive school culture and environment for it's stakeholders. Some steps we are working on include:

1. Needs assessment surveys are sent to lab facilitators, students, parents, and staff to determine ways for SJVS to improve meeting the needs of these stakeholders. The data has helped us to increase course offerings and availability, provide support for in-school learning and tracking progress of lab students, and improve communication with teachers and staff.

2. All teachers attend monthly SAC meetings, and that provides an open forum for teachers to bring concerns and/or needs to the attention of all stakeholders.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.