Clay Virtual Academy

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Clay Virtual Academy

2306 KINGSLEY AVE #20, Orange Park, FL 32073

http://cva.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Steven Amburgey

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2018

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)	1%
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: I
School Grades History	2017-18: 2016-17: 2015-16: 2014-15: 2013-14: I
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	CS&I
* 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 Clay 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

Our mission is to offer a virtual education experience which allows students to dream, achieve, and soar anywhere, anytime on any path.

Provide the school's vision statement

Clay Virtual Academy will provide students a learning path in an innovative online environment where mastery learning is the focus of each child's motivation, organization, and dedication in preparing them to be leaders in a global marketplace.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Amburgey, Steve	Principal
Principal	
Kowieski, Melissa	Assistant Principal
Assistant 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	7	5	5	5	10	7	3	11	18	16	20	27	28	162
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	2	2	3	0	2	2	6	7	12	9	45

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	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
38

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/19/2019

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	
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	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	

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	0%	57%	61%	0%	55%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	53%	59%	0%	47%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	53%	54%	0%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	52%	62%	0%	54%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	49%	59%	0%	49%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	46%	52%	0%	47%	52%
Science Achievement	0%	54%	56%	0%	58%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	77%	78%	0%	74%	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	7 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	10 (0)	7 (0)	3 (0)	11 (0)	18 (0)	16 (0)	20 (0)	27 (0)	28 (0)	162 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	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 (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)	2 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)	12 (0)	9 (0)	45 (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%	68%	-68%	58%	-58%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	64%	-64%	58%	-58%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	62%	-62%	56%	-56%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	61%	-61%	55%	-55%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	57%	-57%	53%	-53%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	0%	71%	-71%	62%	-62%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	69%	-69%	64%	-64%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	64%	-64%	60%	-60%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	0%	63%	-63%	53%	-53%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	64%	-64%	48%	-48%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	65%	-65%	61%	-61%
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	19
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	95
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	50%
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	
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	33
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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

Data not available due to number of students tested in that school year.

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

Data not available due to number of students tested in that school year.

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

Data not available due to number of students tested in that school year.

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

Data not available due to number of students tested in that school year.

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

The biggest potential area of concern is the seven Level 1 assessment results.

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

1. Reduce Level 1 state assessment outcomes
2. Improve student attendance/participation on a regular basis
3. Improve teacher pacing in course content.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Expansion of Instructional Scope to K-12
Rationale	By expanding the grade levels that are offered, teachers and students have greater opportunity to collaborate and deepen positive outcomes, including teacher development and student assessment results.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	50% of students scoring Level 1 on state assessments will show a year's worth of growth in reading.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Melissa Kowieski (melissa.kowieski@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using Homeroom CVA virtual, teachers will help to improve student performance and appropriate pacing for course outcomes by checking in with off-track students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	CVA homeroom teachers will oversee a small group of full-time CVA students each week to monitor their academic progress, pacing, and attendance within each virtual course as a way to help students take ownership of their learning.
Action Step	
Description	1. Designate Home Room teacher and student groups. 2. Train and give expectations to teachers: weekly text/email to on-track students; weekly phone call to off-track (failing) students per state statute. 3. Share follow-up during monthly faculty and/or team meetings.
Person Responsible	Steve Amburgey (steven.amburgey@myoneclay.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)

We have changed our primary virtual instruction provider curriculums for our entire student population from K-5 to K-12 (FuelEducation) and 6-12 Edgenuity. These curriculums will provide a broader scope of support for all grade levels, allowing teachers to engage in a more rigorous vertical articulation strategy resulting in better outcomes for kids.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Expansion of Instructional Scope to K-12	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00