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# School profile

* The Greenfield Commonwealth Virtual School (GCVS), formerly known as Massachusetts Virtual Academy of Greenfield (MAVA), opened in 2010 under the innovation school law (G.L. c. 71, § 92) as a Greenfield Public School. On June 25, 2013, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (Board) granted a three-year certificate to operate the re-named Massachusetts Virtual Academy at Greenfield Commonwealth Virtual School (GCVS) to a Board of Trustees (GCVS Board) formed to assume governance of MAVA from the Greenfield Public Schools. Educational courses and teaching services, including management software, learning materials, and technical support services were provided by [K12, Inc.](http://www.k12.com/) (K12) – a virtual school provider based in Herndon, Virginia.
* On June 5, 2014, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) conducted an accountability review of GCVS in accordance with [CMR 52.08](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr52.html?section=08). The [report](http://www.doe.mass.edu/odl/cmvs/GCVS-Accountability.pdf) documented concerns about the school’s faithfulness to its certificate, the quality of the academic program, the quality and amount of supports for diverse learners, and the school's lack of compliance with regulatory requirements and ESE guidance. Due to these concerns, on October 20, 2014, pursuant to the virtual school regulations at [603 CMR 52.12(2)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr52.html?section=12) and on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Board [placed GCVS on probation](http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/minutes/14/1021reg-1020spec.pdf) for the remainder of its certificate term, which expired on June 30, 2016.
* ESE conducted a second review of GCVS on March 2, 2015. The [report](http://www.doe.mass.edu/odl/cmvs/GCVS-2015-03Accountability.pdf) indicated that GCVS made progress toward meeting the terms of its probation, and noted that the GCVS Board and school leadership took affirmative steps to improve instruction and professional learning. However, the review identified a dependency on teacher-developed materials to ensure curriculum alignment, the lack of a formal curriculum for English language learner (ELL) students, the lack of a formal inclusion model for students with disabilities, variation in the execution of the school’s expectations for teaching higher order thinking skills, and uneven instruction. In a June 29, 2015 [response to the review](http://www.doe.mass.edu/odl/cmvs/GCVS-2015-03Response.pdf), GCVS described the additional steps it planned to take to address these concerns, including researching ELL curricula for the Fall of 2015 and how, in the estimation of school leadership, online interventions presented a clear picture of the performance of students who were experiencing academic difficulties.
* The school’s certificate expired at the end of the 2015-16 school year. Pursuant to [CMR 52.11](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr52.html?section=11), and in accordance with ESE [guidelines](http://www.doe.mass.edu/odl/cmvs/RenewalApp.pdf), on June 28, 2015, GCVS submitted an application to renew its certificate. ESE conducted a renewal inspection in November 2015; the [report](http://www.doe.mass.edu/odl/cmvs/GCVS-2015-12Renewal.pdf) from this inspection was issued to the school on December 14, 2015. At its [February 23, 2016](http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/minutes/2016/0223reg-0222spec.pdf) meeting, in accordance with General Laws chapter 71, section 94, and 603 CMR 52.00, the Board renewed the school’s certificate for a three-year period from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2019 with a maximum enrollment of 750 students in grades K through 12. Further, pursuant to 603 CMR 52.12(2), the Board extended the school’s probationary status and directed it to meet specified terms of probation, as recommended by the Commissioner in his [memorandum to the Board dated February 12, 2016](http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/docs/fy2016/2016-02/item6.pdf).
* The school applied for term amendments for its certificate on June 30, 2017. The Board approved these amendments on October 19, 2017, granting the termination of K12 as the primary learning management system and curriculum. The amendments allowed the school to adopt the Canvas learning management system by Instructure, Inc.; to adopt new curricula, including EngageNY (K-5, English language arts [ELA] and math), and Florida Virtual Schools Global (FLVS) (Grades 6-12, all subjects); and to hire 10 additional staff members.
* On December 14, 2017, ESE conducted a review of GVCS. The review team issued ratings in the areas of academic program success, organizational viability, and faithfulness to certificate, the guiding principles of virtual school accountability. With respect to the first area, faithfulness to certificate, the team's overall finding of "Partially Meets" reflected that GCVS is in the midst of implementing changes to its program design as result of the termination of the school's contract with K12. The second area, academic and program success, received ratings of "Partially Meets," apart from the diverse learners criterion that received a rating of "Falls Far Below" and cited the school's need to develop programming for its small population of English learners. With respect to organizational viability, the team issued "Partially Meets" ratings for school leadership, professional climate, and governance.
* At its March 27, 2018, meeting, pursuant to 603 CMR 52.12(2), the Board extended the school’s probationary status and added a new condition related to the provision of services for English learners , as recommended by the Acting Commissioner in his [memorandum to the Board dated March 16, 2018.](http://www.doe.mass.edu/bese/docs/fy2018/2018-03/item7.html) The school’s status in complying with these terms is addressed in Appendix C.
* Pursuant to [CMR 52.11](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr52.html?section=11), and in accordance with ESE [guidelines](http://www.doe.mass.edu/odl/cmvs/RenewalApp.pdf), on June 27, 2018, GCVS submitted an application to renew its certificate. A vendor hired by ESE conducted a renewal inspection in October 2018.

# Description of the accountability review

On October 18, 2018, the following members of the renewal inspection review team (team) visited GCVS at its administrative offices, located at 278 Main Street, Suite 205, Greenfield, MA 01301:

| * Kara Dunn, Team Lead, SchoolWorks
* Dominique Astier, Team Member, SchoolWorks
 | * Erin Burchill, Team Writer, SchoolWorks
* Casel Walker, Team Member, SchoolWorks
 |
| --- | --- |

The team reviewed the following information:

| * Application for certificate renewal
* Annual report, FY 2016 and FY 2017
* Accountability reports
* Personnel policies, including the GCVS employee handbook and GCVS student and family handbook
* Board meeting agendas and minutes
* Organizational chart and staff assignments
* Annual goals
* Leadership team agendas and meeting minutes
* Special education program statement
* Special Education Procedural Manual
 | * Sample teacher and administrator evaluation documents
* Documentation of professional development activities and calendar
* Documentation of school-sponsored events and outings
* English as a second language (ESL) program statement and associated English language learner (ELL) documents
* Student demographic information
* Curricular materials, including an alignment of the school’s curriculum to the [Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks](http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/current.html); “power standards” and curriculum-based assessments
 |
| --- | --- |

The team collectively observed 24 online lessons in real time or asynchronously over a 1-month window in September-October of 2018.

On site, the team conducted focus group interviews with representatives from the following groups: school leaders (5); board of trustees (3); special education (7); student support specialists (6); K-5 teachers (3); middle school teachers (5); high school teachers (1); learning coaches of middle school students (4); high school learning coaches (2); middle school students (3); and high school students (2).[[1]](#footnote-2)

# Ratings

| **Faithfulness to certificate** |
| --- |
| 1. **Mission and key design elements:** Is faithful to its mission, implements the key design elements outlined in its certificate, and substantially meets its accountability plan goals.
 | **Partially Meets** |
| **Academic and program success** |
| 1. **Student performance:** Consistently meets state student performance standards for academic growth, proficiency, and college-and-career-readiness.
 |  **Not rated** |
| 1. **Program delivery:** Delivers improved academic outcomes and educational success for all students.
 |  |
| * 1. **Instruction**
 | **Partially meets** |
| * 1. **Assessment and program evaluation**
 | **Partially meets** |
| * 1. **Diverse learners**
 | **Partially meets** |
| 1. **Culture and Family Engagement:** supports students’ social and emotional health in a safe and respectful learning environment that engages families
 | **Meets** |
| **Organizational viability** |
| 1. **Capacity:** Sustains a well-functioning organizational structure and creates a professional working climate for all staff.
 |  |
| * 1. **School leadership**
 | **Meets** |
| * 1. **Professional climate**
 | **Partially meets** |
| 1. **Governance:** Board of Trustees acts as public agents authorized by the state and provide competent governance to ensure success and sustainability.
 | **Partially meets** |
| **Rating Scale:** |
|  **Exceeds** | Fully and consistently meets the criterion; potential exemplar |
| **Meets** | Generally, meets the criterion; minor concerns are noted |
| **Partially Meets** | Meets some aspects of the criterion but not others and/or moderate concerns are noted |
|  **Falls far below** | Falls far below the criterion; significant concern(s) are noted |

# Faithfulness to certificate

### Mission and key design elements

**Rating: Partially Meets **

###### Finding: School stakeholders share a common understanding of the school’s mission and key goals of the school. GVCS has made progress in implementing recent amendments to the school’s certificate. GVCS is not fully providing students with the promises of its mission statement.

GCVS stakeholders share a common and consistent understanding of the school’s mission**.** Board members, school administrators, teachers, parents, and students interviewed during the site visit consistently reported on the mission and could describe both the mission and key goals of the certificate and accountability plan. The renewal inspection team observed multiple visuals of the mission statement throughout the school building during the visit, including framed versions in the conference rooms and hallways and a large banner in the lobby. The mission reads:

“The Greenfield Commonwealth Virtual School, a public school of choice, serves students from across Massachusetts who need a learning community that is accessible and flexible. We give our students and their families choices in what, how, when, and where they learn. As a pioneer of online personalized learning, we empower our educators to tailor learning experiences to each student’s strengths, interests, and challenges. We redefine and change how students and teachers engage through innovative technology, while ensuring mastery of competencies embedded in a rigorous curriculum.”

School stakeholders reported the key elements of the school were to provide a flexible, individualized, personalized, and accessible education. Focus groups consistently reported that GCVS gives families and students an important, non-brick-and-mortar option for students that need more flexibility and different types of accessibility.

In both the board and school leader focus groups, stakeholders reported important, recent amendments to the certificate, all of which pertained to the implementation of the school’s mission. The first amendment was ending the contractual relationship with K12 Inc. In July 2017, GVCS transitioned from K12 as the contracted provider of the educational program and learning management system to the Canvas platform for virtual learning. The second amendment changed the name of the school from Massachusetts Commonwealth Virtual Learning School to Greenfield Commonwealth Virtual School (GVCS). The third amendment changed the mission statement and board bylaws. The key goals of the school are listed on the GCVS website, as is the mission in full. According to the school’s application for certificate renewal, GCVS makes its accountability goals and strategies available to the public on its website, sharing them with faculty, and emailing them out to all families in March 2018.

As indicated in the accountability goals, the school is implementing the Canvas learning platform and is in the early stages of implementing new curricula via Canvas. All focus groups reported the school’s use of Canvas, and the accountability plan speaks to this shift as well. Additionally, the site visit team conducted all classroom observations in Canvas with Blackboard Learning. All asynchronous modules are in Canvas learning; teachers and school leaders also use this platform to communicate with students. The school’s application for renewal contains an accountability plan goal, reported as met, that GCVS would develop curriculum that aligned to the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks. Teacher, board, and school leader focus groups reported, however, that the focus this year is on developing teacher-created lessons, modules, and units.

The renewal inspection team gathered mixed evidence that GVCS is currently providing students with the opportunity to “engage through innovative technology, while ensuring mastery of competencies embedded in a rigorous curriculum.” Elementary teachers (K-5) are using EngageNY curricula in their classes and modules. They have adapted the EngageNY curriculum to fit virtual needs. Grades six through twelve are currently using the Florida Virtual School (FLVS) curriculum. The renewal inspection team observed 24 classes during a one-month window. Observations of classes varied in the degree to which they tailored learning experiences and engagement through innovative technology. For example, few observed lessons included student discourse, a majority featured whole class instruction, and site visit team members observed mostly one-way question and answers between student and teacher. Asynchronous work was text-heavy and visuals were seldom seen. Few teachers used videos or PowerPoint presentations and visitors observed mostly low-level questions such as identification and multiple choice with closed answers or one-word answers in chat.

# Academic and program success

### Student performance

**2018 Overall Classification: Requiring Assistance and Intervention**

**2018 Accountability Percentile: Insufficient Data**

**2018 Progress Toward Meeting Targets: 18 percent**

***Finding: During the charter term, GVCS did not meet gap narrowing goals in 2015 and 2016 and was placed in Level 3 due to low academic performance. In 2017, schools such as GVCS that administered the Next-Generation MCAS assessment in grades 3-8 were not assigned a level. In 2018, GVCS partially met targets for indicators included in the new statewide accountability system. In 2018, GVCS is classified as requiring assistance or intervention due to low graduation rates and low participation rates. A majority of student performance data have been consistently below state rates since 2015.***

The purpose of the statewide accountability system is to provide clear, actionable information about school performance. The accountability indicators used for each school depend on the grades served and the assessments administered. Following is summary information for GVCS over the past four years, with any areas of significant concern described in further detail. More detailed information related to student performance is included on the Department’s website (<http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/accountability/report/school.aspx?linkid=31&orgcode=39010900&orgtypecode=6&>). Please note that in general, caution is required when making comparisons across years when there were changes to the state accountability system. As a result of significant changes to the state’s accountability system in 2018, comparisons between 2018 accountability results and historical accountability data should not be made.

*Accountability and Assistance Level/Overall Classification*

Prior to 2018, all Massachusetts schools and districts with sufficient data were classified into one of five accountability and assistance levels (1-5), with the highest performing in Level 1 and lowest performing in Level 5. Beginning in 2018, all Massachusetts districts and schools with sufficient data were classified into one of two accountability categories: districts and schools requiring assistance or intervention, and districts and schools without required assistance or intervention.

| **Accountability and Assistance Level** | **Overall Classification** |
| --- | --- |
| **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
|  **Level 3**: Among lowest performing 20% of schools and subgroupsVery low assessment participation (Less than 90%) | **Level 3**: Among lowest performing 20% of schools and subgroupsLow assessment participation (Less than 95%) |  **No Level**: Students in this school participated in 2017 Next-Generation MCAS tests | **Requiring assistance or intervention**:In need of focused/targeted support: Low graduation rate and low participation rate**Progress Toward Improvement Targets**:18% |

*School Percentile/Accountability Percentile*

Prior to 2018, a school percentile between 1 and 99 was reported for schools with at least four years of data. This number is an indication of the school's overall performance relative to other schools that serve the same or similar grades.

| **School Percentile** |
| --- |
| **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
|  8 | 7 | -- |

Beginning in 2018, an accountability percentile between 1 and 99 is reported for most schools. This number is an indication of the school's overall performance relative to other schools that serve similar grades, and is calculated using data for all accountability indicators. The 2018 accountability percentile should not be compared to school percentiles calculated in 2015-2017 because they represent different calculations. GVCS did not have sufficient data to calculate growth percentiles for high school grades in 2018, hence the school did not receive an accountability percentile in 2018.

| **Accountability Percentile** |
| --- |
| **2018** |
| Insufficient Data |

*Next-Generation MCAS Tests*

Next-Generation MCAS tests were given in English language arts and mathematics in grades 3 through 8 starting in 2017. Scaled scores range from 440 to 560. Students meet expectations in the scaled score range of 500 to 529 and exceed expectations in the scaled score range of 530-560.

| **Next-Generation MCAS Tests** |
| --- |
| **Grade and Subject** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations** | **Avg. Scaled Score** | **Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations** | **Avg. Scaled Score** |
| **School** | **State** | **School** | **State** | **School** | **State** | **School** | **State** |
| **Grades 3-8 English Language Arts** | 29 | 49 | 489 | 499 | 26 | 51 | 489 | 500 |
| **Grades 3-8 Mathematics** | 20 | 48 | 483 | 499 | 19 | 48 | 482 | 498 |

*Composite Performance Index*

The Composite Performance Index is a 100-point index that serves as a measure of the extent to which all students are progressing toward proficiency. When all students score Proficient or Advanced on the legacy MCAS assessment, the CPI will be 100.

| **Composite Performance Index** |
| --- |
| **Grade and Subject** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **School** | **State** | **School** | **State** | **School** | **State** | **School** | **State** |
| **Grade 5 Science and Tech/Eng** | 72.5 | 78.2 | 61.0 | 76.4 | 62.8 | 75.3 | 54.1 | 76.5 |
| **Grade 8 Science and Tech/ Eng** | 64.4 | 72.4 | 56.0 | 71.3 | 60.7 | 70.6 | 54.5 | 68.3 |
| **Grade 10 English Language Arts** | 93.2 | 96.7 | 100 | 96.7 | 96.2 | 96.5 | 95.6 | 96.2 |
| **Grade 10 Mathematics** | 80.7  |  89.9 |  80.6 | 89.7  | 81.8  | 89.9  |  77.6 |  89.5 |
| **Grade 10 Science** |  - |  88.2 |  90.0 | 89.0  |  86.8 |  89.4 |  60.5 | 89.3  |

*Student Growth Percentile*

The Department uses Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs) to demonstrate progress in student achievement each year. SGPs are generated based on student performance on statewide assessments, including MCAS and/or PARCC in 2015 and 2016 and the Next-Generation MCAS in 2017 and 2018. In 2015 and 2016, transitional SGP was calculated based on PARCC and prior MCAS scores. In 2018, DESE began including average SGP in all assessment and accountability reports instead of median SGP. In general, SGPs in the range of 1-39 are associated with lower growth, SGPs in the range of 40-60 are associated with moderate growth, and SGPs in the range of 61-99 are associated with higher growth.

| **Student Growth Percentile** |
| --- |
| **Grade and Subject** | **PARCC** | **Next-Generation MCAS** |
| **Transitional SGP** | **Median SGP** | **Average SGP** |
| **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Grades 3-8 English Language Arts** | 40.0  | 41.5 | 37.0  |  43.2 |
| **Grades 3-8 Mathematics** | 45.0  | 35.0 | 31.5  |  42.9 |
| **Grade and Subject** | **MCAS** |
| **Median SGP** | **Average SGP** |
| **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **Grade 10 English Language Arts** | -  |  59.5 | 35.0  |  47.2 |
| **Grade 10 Mathematics** |  - |  47.0 |  34.0 | 33.4  |

*Graduation and Dropout Rates*

The 4-year graduation rate is the percentage of students in an annual cohort who graduate with a regular high school diploma within 4 years.

|  | **2014 cohort** | **2015 cohort** | **2016 cohort** | **2017 cohort** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GVCS** | #N/A | 22.2 | 40.0 | 31.6 |
| **Statewide** |  86.1 | 87.3 | 87.5 | 88.3 |

The 5-year graduation rate is the percentage of students in an annual cohort who graduate with a regular high school diploma within 5 years. Data for the 2016 cohort is the most recent available because it includes students in that cohort who graduated as late as 2017.

| **5-Year Graduation Rate (Percent Graduated)** |
| --- |
|  | **2014 cohort** | **2015 cohort** | **2016 cohort** |
| **GVCS** | #N/A | 59.3 | 46.7 |
| **Statewide** | 88.5 | 89.4 | 89.8 |

Dropout rates are reported for high school students who drop out of high school.

| **Dropout Rate (Percent Dropout)** |
| --- |
|  | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| **GVCS** |  11.2 | 9.6 | 28.7 | 24.9 |
| **Statewide** |  2.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.8 |

### 5a. Program delivery - Instruction

**Rating: Partially meets** 

###### Finding: It is unclear if school stakeholders share a common understanding of GVCS’ common instructional strategies. Observed instruction did not reflect high expectations for all students and time was not maximized for learning. Approximately half of all observed instruction engaged students. Observed instruction did contain routines and practices that were conducive to learning.

It is unclear if school administrators and teachers share a common understanding of the school’s expected instructional strategies. Prior to conducting classroom observations, the school provided the site visit team with a list of the school’s common instructional practices. These included: classroom rules and routines that are clearly established and reviewed; students encouraged to use the microphone and camera; effective use of whole- and small-group instruction; discourse focused on learning goals; quick transitions; the use of Blackboard tools; entrance and exit tickets; breakout groups; high impact practices (learning objectives, exit tickets); reconvening of whole group at end of lesson to review/summarize; high-level questioning; frequent questioning to check for understanding using multiple modes; instruction aligned with modules in Canvas; small groups in breakout rooms led by special education and Title I teachers; materials supplied to students; Structured English Immersion (SEI) practices; and assistive technologies and behavioral supports. When, in focus groups, teachers were asked to define GVCS’ expectations for teacher instruction, teachers reported that they are expected to be at home at their computers from 8:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m. Additionally, teachers reported an expectation to use engagement strategies within live lessons.

In the majority of classroom observations, many of the school’s stated expectations for instruction were observed. More specifically, in 17 out of 24 observed classes, the site visit team found sufficient evidence of the school’s expected practices throughout observed instructional time. The team observed two of the school’s expected practices were most often present during lessons. Learning objectives were often visible or referenced by multiple teachers. Exit tickets were seen in asynchronous lessons or discussed by teachers even in lessons in which observers did not see the end of the lesson. However, the site visit team noted that chat was the main form of communication between students and teachers; the use of the microphone and hand raising were seldom observed. Additionally, the site visit team observed whole group instruction in nearly all lessons, noting that only 2 classrooms out of 24 utilized the breakout rooms.

Observed instruction did not reflect high expectations for all students. The renewal inspection team only observed evidence of instructional activities that challenged all students to develop and use higher-order thinking in 8 of the 24 classes observed. In those 8 classes, teachers asked high-level questions and required students to respond in a variety of ways (chat, microphone, emoticons); learning objectives were reviewed at the beginning of the lesson, ensuring that students knew what the goals were for the day. In the 16 classes that did not reflect high expectations, renewal inspection team members observed: students answering comparing and contrasting questions with one-word answers; learning coaches providing answers on behalf of students in a few classrooms; and a teacher lecture with little student input. Observers recorded multiple instances of teachers answering their own questions as opposed to student responses.

Just over half of observations showed evidence of fostering student engagement. In 13 out of 24 classes, the site visit team observed classroom practices that fostered student engagement. Site visit team members observed evidence of teachers and students using chat functions in most classrooms, with 3 classes using emoticons in chat to increase engagement. Entrance and exit tickets were used in most classrooms. Breakout groups were observed in only 2 classes out of 24. Additionally, site visit team members did not observe opportunities for students to engage with each other and have discussions. For instance, teachers did not allow students to converse, instead directing students to complete a task. Multiple class observations did not show any students on camera or using the microphone. However, some grade levels showed many students on camera. Site visit team members also recorded the absence of whole classes in observations, teachers late or not connected, and students arriving to class late.

Classroom environments were conducive to learning, but learning time was not maximized in just over half of observed classes. Observed classroom instruction displayed evidence of clear routines, respectful relationships, behaviors, and tone and discourse in 21 of the 24 observed classes. The majority of teachers spoke in respectful tones, and the site visit team heard multiple examples of positive narration. Learning time, however, was not maximized for all students in slightly over half of the observed classes. Eleven out of 24 classrooms showed evidence of maximizing learning time. In the classes that did not maximize time, teachers took 2-to-3 minutes to open technology at the beginning of class and then allowed Do Nows to go on for an extended period of time. The use of the chat function in middle and high school classes led to a loss of instructional time while students waited for the teacher to respond to each chat. The site visit team also noted that discussions lasted for the entirety of some observations, but such discussions were absent of student discourse; students responded to the teacher only, not to each other.

### 5b. Program delivery - Assessment and program evaluation

**Rating: Partially meets** 

###### Finding: GVCS implements many forms of assessment. Teachers use data to adjust instruction, but GVCS does not systematically using data to evaluate the quality or effectiveness of all of its programs.

GCVS reviews formative and summative data to monitor progress and improve student outcomes**.** Regular benchmark assessments given throughout the school year include Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy (DIBELS) (in grades K-6), Fountas & Pinnell benchmarks, Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM) assessments, Lexia, as well as Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) and ACCESS testing as reported by school leaders and teachers. Using teacher-created materials, interim formative assessments are given, including the use of exit tickets in daily lessons. Special education staff also reported using Orton Gillingham reading assessments for progress monitoring and assessment of students with disabilities. Families were completing home language surveys, and students were being screened using World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) at the time of the site visit in October. School leaders reported they will use the results to identify English learners (ELs), develop plans, and follow all State guidelines with respect to students who are English learners.

Individually and in teams, teachers are using data to adjust instruction.According to school leaders, the student intervention team (SIT) is focused on students who present with academic concerns, based on teacher reports, exit tickets, in-class assessments, and summative data. This team, comprised of special education teachers with input from administration and school counselors, meet weekly and determine appropriate strategies to implement with students. Frequency of follow-up meetings is dependent on each individual student. The engagement team (all family engagement coordinators, the school nurse, and guidance counselors), works to ensure students are engaged not only in classes but in the school community as well and meets monthly with school leaders and bi-weekly as a team. Half of the engagement team’s bi-weekly meeting is spent discussing individual student needs and concerns reported by teachers and based on attendance as well as collected Canvas’ Dropout Detective data (meant to identify “at risk” students); the other half focuses on conversations with learning coaches. School leaders also reported that teaching teams meet in Professional Learning Communities (PLC) once a month. Team leaders plan and facilitate these meetings that focus on looking at data and analyzing it for improvement in instructional practice.

The school is not systematically using data to evaluate the quality or effectiveness of all of its programs. GVCS collected survey data about its orientation program: “Bigger, Brighter Beginnings program”. Bigger, Brighter Beginnings is a mandatory program for all students and Learning Coaches held at the end of the beginning of the year to provide them with support on navigating new systems, best practices regarding time management, structuring learning environments at home, and answering questions from families. It was unclear how this data is used to alter that programming. When asked how they self-evaluate special education and English learner programs, focus group members could not provide an answer. There is no formal self-assessment currently in place.

According to school leaders, proctoring State-level exams continues to be a concern for GCVS. At the time of the site visit, school leaders said this was an issue on which they were currently working to remedy. For certain circumstances, GCVS buses students to a school in order to take MCAS. School administrators reported that because students are used to going to school online and not in a brick-and-mortar school, the change in environment greatly impacts student performance on MCAS assessments. They would like to be able to give their students the MCAS online at home so that students are given a chance to take the test in their regular learning environment.

### 5c. Program delivery - Diverse learners

**Rating: Partially meets** 

###### Finding: GVCS has systems to identify students in needs of supports, including English learners. GVCS has supports and resources for diverse learners, but team members observed few in use during instruction.

As reported by school leaders and members of the student support team, the school uses the State-mandated home language survey to screen all students entering GCVS for EL development. The home language survey is sent to all incoming students. At the time of the site visit, in October, the site visit team observed that the EL teacher was in the process of setting up WIDA screening appointments for students whose family indicated that a language other than English as spoken at home; no ELs had been identified yet. According to school leaders, all incoming student records are reviewed by student support staff. Plans are then put in place for students who are identified as ELs and for students with disabilities to ensure that they receive the services they require after reviewing the WIDA screener and student records. The English Learner Education (ELE) program plan is outlined in a document provided by GCVS.

School leaders reported that they are anticipating mostly push-in services at all levels for EL students. Over this past summer, the EL teacher embedded curriculum inside general education history and science classes and plans to expand this support to other courses. Once EL students are identified, the EL teacher will work with general education teachers who have students enrolled in their general education courses using the newly developed curriculum. It was reported to the site visit team that almost all teachers have their SEI endorsement, but the EL teacher will be consulting with general education teachers to incorporate SEI strategies into their lessons.

The director of student support identified the process for identifying students needing special education services as the following: the Student Intervention Team (SIT) receives referrals from general education teachers for students who have not been successful with Tier I interventions. The SIT team looks at the referral form and other data and determines if the problem is rooted in student engagement or something more. If it is determined to be something more than engagement, the referral is sent to the special education team who decides with the SIT if further testing needs to be completed. Teachers described this process as ongoing and spoke of trying suggested Tier 1 strategies with students and keeping records of progress for 6 weeks. If students do not make progress, tier 2 interventions might be introduced, such as social skills groups or meeting with the school nurse. Tier 3 students go through special education testing and have an eligibility meeting with the director of student support.

According to school leaders, GCVS offers some data-driven resources to students, but few were observed by the site visit team. Moby Max and Lexia are computer-based interventions provided to students as needed for reading and math support. Teachers identified strategic grouping in breakout rooms being a resource and reported that students are often grouped based on various sources of data. However, a majority of observed classrooms did not reflect use of breakout rooms. Teachers reported that special educators provide “push-in” support to students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and the school also offers separate academic support classes. School leaders reported that the family engagement coordinator provides support then students struggle with engagement as indicated by Canvas’ Dropout Detective data. While GCVS provides these resources and supports to students, the site visit team noted an absence of supports and resources during observed instruction, other than all teachers being SEI-endorsed, for EL students.

General education teachers also provide built-in support for students. According to teachers, at the high school level, Wednesday is a shorter class day. Teachers have one-on-one meetings with students who they determine need support or for students who identify themselves as needing support and are available via email to parents and students. Similar to the high school, Friday is the middle school intervention day. Students meet with teachers one-on-one or in small groups for support or direct instruction. Elementary teachers have flex-time in their weekly plans during which students who need extra help go to interventions in reading or math two times per week. The director of student services also noted that text-to-speech and the use of a microphone in class is available to all students as well.

### School culture and family engagement

**Social, emotional, and health needs; family and community engagement**

**Rating: Meets**

***Finding: GVCS provides an emotionally and physically safe learning environment. GVCS consistently communicates with students and families and provides opportunities for students and families to engage with their community.***

**Social, emotional, and health needs:**

The school environment is physically and emotionally safe for students.All participants in the student focus group reported that they feel safe at school at GCVS. Students reported that GCVS does not allow bullying. Inappropriate chats are shut down and they find teachers to be supportive. Students and parents reported that teachers are welcoming. Parents reported that teachers give overall support to students and work one-on-one with students frequently. Parents can observe classes and see chats. They reported students speak appropriately and have little stress and maximum flexibility at GCVS. School leaders and teachers reported that students chose to attend GCVS because the school alleviates their anxiety. For instance, some students indicated that they are too afraid to speak in brick-and-mortar classes. Teachers and school leaders reported they feel as though many of these students would not attend school if it were not for GCVS. Observational data showed that the majority of classrooms (21 out of 24 observed) had classroom climates characterized by clear routines, respectful relationships, behaviors, tone, and discourse.

The school employs staff to address the physical, social, emotional, and health needs of its students and support students and families. These positions include a school nurse, who also serves as the engagement team leader, two high school guidance counselors, and three family engagement coordinators. School leader focus group members also reported that GCVS contracts outside of its staff to provide students with counseling services, speech and language, physical therapy, and other services students and families may require.

The school has structures that result in a respectful learning environment. GCVS’s Parent Student Handbook contains Acceptable Use policies and outlines appropriate online behavior for students. School leaders also explained the process of monitoring and reporting cyberbullying with the site team, explaining consequences and steps to ensure that the behavior does not continue. There are technology guards such as Lightspeed on all Chromebooks and multiple means of virtual technology to safeguard browsing habits and interactions. GCVS is in the process of implementing a new product called Gaggle – a safety management program for students which will go through the Canvas and GSuite domains looking for key works and using algorithms to analyze how student communicate in each platform. It also scans static images and thumbnails on videos for inappropriate conduct and content.

**Family and community engagement:**

Faculty and staff communicate critical information about student progress to families so that parents and learning coaches are engaged with teachers and administrators for supporting online learning. The school works to ensure effective communication with families. While members of the parent focus group said there is a need to improve access to administrators by phone, they overall thought communication was good. They reported all emails sent to students are also sent to parents, and teachers are available by phone. School leaders reported that learning coaches always have access to all lessons and that four academic reports go out per year to each student’s family. In focus groups, teachers reported that they send out weekly newsletters to let families know what will be covered in class and through curriculum, as well as upcoming events on the calendar. Teachers reported that they are available by email all the time and respond within 24 hours.

The school leader focus group named a variety of ways the school continuously communicates with families and the broader community naming Twitter, Facebook, Canvas messenger, robo-calls, and a newsletter as communication media. They also almost weekly add new posts to their website. The student support focus group reported that there is interest in forming a parent-teacher organization (PTO) at the elementary level where there would be more opportunities for families to meet and talk and get more families involved in the school community. GVCS currently provides a K-5 networking event, Parent Power Hour, that takes place each month. Members of the student support focus group also reported a number of external partners that GCVS maintains. A psychiatrist is available, when needed, in Springfield; s/he helps find community resources. School leaders also reported GCVS offers dual enrollment through any state college or university, with a special partnership with Greenfield Community College; currently, there are fewer than 10 students enrolled.

School leaders reported that GCVS now has a mandatory program for all students and families entering the school called Bigger, Brighter Beginnings. This past year, GCVS had 15 different locations at community colleges and hotels around the State to run this one time program for more than 600 students and their families. Staff took families through learning stations to explore Canvas components and tools, as well as explained how to establish good learning environments in the home. Ongoing outings also occur throughout the year that are more academically focused. Current examples found on the GCVS website include a middle and high school “meetup” on November 1 to see a performance of *The Diary of Anne Frank* at the Unity House Theater in Springfield. Elementary school students were invited to a meetup on November 16 at Old Sturbridge Village where they would learn about “National Holidays with a focus on the First Thanksgiving; engage in a lesson about math was used in the 1800s trades and in the general store; look at how land was used back in the 19th century and compare that use to how we use land in the 21st century; and enjoy a read-aloud of *The Ox Cart Man* by Donald Hall, comparing the story to life in 19th century America.” The elementary meetup will also be live-streamed for students who cannot attend the event.

# Organizational viability

### 7a. Capacity – School leadership

**Rating: Meets**

***Finding: GVCS has defined and delineated roles and has developed common understanding for decision-making and communication.***

The school clearly defines and delineates roles for school stakeholders, including (but not limited to) staff and administrators. The school leader focus group discussed their roles, stating that they are in charge of day-to-day school functions, curriculum, and instruction. The board of trustees serves as what school leaders likened to a “school committee:” enacting policy; overseeing the budget; and hiring and firing the executive director (ED) and special education director. According to the organizational chart provided by GCVS, the ED evaluates the technology support specialist, director of teaching and learning, director of student services, and director of business services. The director of teaching and learning is responsible for evaluating all general education teachers, which includes 6 elementary teachers, 8 middle school teachers, 12 high school teachers, and 3 unified arts teachers. The director of student services is responsible for evaluating the school nurse, 3 family engagement coordinators, 2 guidance counselors, 0.5 consulting English as a second language (ESL) teacher, 7 special educators, and 2 Title I teachers. In a focus group, teachers reported that administration communicates frequently with the staff. They often ask for input from teachers, especially when it comes to professional development. Teachers indicated that they generally feel their opinions are asked for and heard. The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT), comprised of teachers and school leaders, views data such as exit tickets and homework trackers from teachers to identify trends and areas of need and decide what adjustments need to be made.

The school has a common understanding for decision-making and communication among all members of the school community. Focus groups communicated that team leads have an important role in communication at GCVS. Ideas are discussed in team meetings around curriculum and instruction, and team leads are responsible for bringing these ideas back to the instructional team. Team leaders then bring back the instructional team’s decisions to their teacher teams. The ED communicated that she wants to know what people think and hear what they have to bring to the table; teachers reported that they have a voice at GCVS. School leaders communicated the roles of the board and the role they play in decision-making. They confirmed that both the board and school leaders follow the accountability plan as their set of goals. The site visit team observed the respect shown for the different “lanes” in which the board and school leaders operate. It was clear to the site visit team that each entity knows where its responsibilities lie, and each respect the role of the other entity in supporting and growing GCVS.

At the time of the site visit, the board of trustees was in the process of hiring an interim ED as the current ED had outlined her intention to retire by early 2019.

### 7b. Capacity – Professional climate

**Rating: Partially meets** 

***Finding: GVCS provides teachers with opportunities to collaborate, but formal professional development is infrequent. GVCS has a system to monitor instruction.***

The school provides teachers with opportunities for regular and frequent collaboration; however, formal professional development (PD) is infrequent. Collaboration among teachers is required and encouraged at GCVS. Focus groups with school leaders and teachers reported multiple teaming structures that serve different purposes at GCVS. For instance, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) meet on a monthly basis and agendas are determined by team leads. PLCs meetings are vertical content meetings during which alignment and collaboration on curriculum is the main focus. Per the PD calendar for 2018-19 provided, PLCs review assessment data and use the Big 4 Questions as the driving focus of meetings: What do we want our students to learn? How will we know they’ve learned it? How will we respond when they don’t learn it? How can we extend and enrich the learning for those who have demonstrated proficiency/competency? Engagement coordinators meet bi-weekly by grade level to discuss students they have in common. The EL teacher and one family engagement coordinator are currently collaborating to conduct home visits together. GCVS also requires weekly grade-level meetings. Professional development is geared toward virtual instruction, developing competencies, and other State-mandated trainings. All faculty attended: an onsite PD in Hadley, MA on August 22 and 23, 2018; a Virtual PD day on October 19, 2018; and will attend the Northeast Online Teaching Institute on April 4 and 5 2019, as well as an end-of-the-year PD day on a date to be determined.

The school has processes to monitor instructional practice for consistency. Teacher evaluation includes a formal process, as reported in teacher and school leader focus groups; all GCVS evaluations use the Massachusetts Model Educator Evaluation Framework. According to school leaders, the director of curriculum and instruction evaluates all teachers; the director of student support evaluates all special education, EL, and support staff; and the ED evaluates both directors. At the time of the site visit, all teachers and staff were working to complete SMART goals in their PLCs based on the accountability plan. Most teachers utilize shared team goals, as reported by school leaders. Teachers self-assess at the beginning of the year, and observations start later in the fall. At the time of the site visit, no formal or informal observations had been conducted. Teachers reported that they are observed, both announced and unannounced in both live and recorded lessons. School leaders reported that they follow all processes as outlined in the Massachusetts Model Educator Evaluation Framework with respect to teacher evaluation. School leaders also noted that there is a faculty course in Canvas that centers around understanding educator evaluation at GCVS.

The organizational structure indicates appropriate staffing levels, including student-to-teacher ratios and ensures that all staff are qualified and trained to deliver online instruction. Review of the 2018-19 staff roster indicated that GCVS employs 6 elementary teachers, 8 middle school teachers, and 12 high school teachers, 7 special education teachers, 2 Title One teachers (mathematics and reading specialists), 3 unified arts teachers, 2 guidance counselors, 3 family engagement coordinators, 1 EL consulting teacher, one school nurse, 3 directors, 1 technology support specialist, 1 enrollment specialist, and 1 executive director. During observed classroom instruction, the team observed classes ranging from 1:3 ratio of teacher-student to a ratio of 1:29 teacher-students.

### 8.Governance

**Rating: Partially meets** 

***Finding: Board members have some processes to ensure oversight of the school’s academic program, school leadership, and progress toward school goals.***

Board members are active and engaged in fulfilling their legal responsibilities and obligations to the school.The GCVS board currently includes 5 members; one did not return this past year and one was not renewed. Current membership is at the minimum allowed by the board’s bylaws. The board meets on a monthly basis. A review of board minutes notes an adherence to Open Meeting Law at the beginning of each meeting. As reported by the board, the ED helps them board follow all laws and board policies.

The board demonstrates some oversight of the school’s leader, financial health, progress toward meeting academic goals, and alignment with the mission, while remaining a governing authority.In the focus group conducted with the board, they discussed their role and the role of school administrators. The board noted that the ED is always at board meetings and is an integral part of meetings; anything that comes from the board goes through her to the school. They noted that the ED is responsible for the day-to-day business of the school and that the board oversees her and deals primarily with policy matters. The business manager attends most board meetings, updating members on the budget, planning the next fiscal year, and recently discussing the major financial issue of K12. The board reported that, due to new, increased pupil tuition, they approved a salary raise of 10 percent for staff this year.

The board reported that they monitor academic progress on a yearly basis by looking at MCAS results and trends. They reported that progress-monitoring/interim data is not examined by the board; that is the responsibility of the ED and school administration. As reported, the board has a process for evaluating the ED, which happens at the end of the school year. The ED has a set of goals for the year that reflect the accountability goals and gives the board a report at the end of the year which they go through with her in an evaluation meeting. The board then makes recommendations to her based on that evaluation. At the time of the visit, the current ED was planning for her retirement and the board was engaged in a process to hire an interim ED. Board members reported that they were not opposed to hiring the interim ED permanently if s/he is a good fit for GCVS.

The board does not consistently engage in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting and regularly monitoring progress relative to goals/priorities that are aligned with the school’s mission, vision, and core values. The board reported that they do not engage in strategic planning but have a yearly retreat and use the accountability plan to focus planning and decision-making efforts. Board members reported that they cannot have a strategic plan at this time; their focus has been placed on shifts away from K12 Inc. and the establishment of the new learning management system. The recruitment of new members is ongoing; they reported that they look for members with different expertise. For example, due to the recent issues with K12 Inc., the board is currently looking to fill vacancies with expertise in legal matters. Members of the board indicated that they depend on the ED to do all the board member recruitment and are unclear about what they will do with this task when she retires.

# Appendix A: Expected practices

Prior to conducting observations of online lessons, ESE requested and received descriptions of expected practices aligned to ESE’s criteria for classroom culture and management and quality instruction. Below are GVCS’ expected practices that the renewal inspection team used to assess observed classroom instruction.

| **Description (ESE)** | **Expected practice (CMVS)** |
| --- | --- |
| Classroom culture and management |
| Classroom climate is characterized by clear routines, respectful relationships, behaviors, tones, and discourse | Classroom rules and routines are clearly established and reviewed periodically as necessary. Appropriate use of chat is reviewed. Students are encouraged in the use of mic and camera. |
| Learning time is maximized for all students | Teacher makes effective use of whole group and small group instruction as necessary to meet stated objectives. Discourse is focused on meeting the learning goals. Transitions are quick and minimize disruptions to as to maintain student engagement. |
| Classroom practices foster student engagement | Blackboard tools such as chat, polls, emoticons to check for engagement and understanding. Entrance and exit tickets used to activate and reinforce learning. Breakout groups are utilized as necessary and on a grade-appropriate level to foster smaller group collaboration among students. |
|  Quality Instruction |
| Instructional practices are consistent with the school’s expected practice | Teachers utilize high impact practices as described by John Hattie. This includes the use of Learning Objectives during the beginning of the lesson and a developmentally-appropriate Exit Ticket at the end of the lesson to assess understanding. Small groups are assigned to breakout rooms as appropriate to collaborate with peers and demonstrate understanding of concepts resented to the whole group following the introductory portion of the lesson.Students demonstrate their understanding of content objectives during the lesson through a variety of means as developmentally appropriate: mic, chat, screen sharing and annotation, etc. Teachers reconvene the whole group at the end of the lesson to review and summarize prior to completion of the Exit Ticket. |
| Instruction/activities challenge all students to develop and use higher order thinking (analyzing, creating, evaluating) | Questioning is predominately at higher levels within the depth of knowledge hierarchy. |
| Teacher uses various checks for understanding throughout the lesson | Frequent use of questioning to check for understanding utilizing multiple modes –polling, chat, mic, Nearpod, screenshare and annotation, etc. |
| Instruction provides skill/content that are aligned to grade-level standards and/or students’ educational needs | Instruction is aligned with content modules in Canvas. Teachers reference that content (assignments expected to be complete by the start of the lesson, assignments to follow the lesson) during instruction. |
| Activities/materials/strategies are differentiated to provide support for all learners | Small groups in breakout rooms may be assigned by teachers according to student needs or may be random to ensure heterogeneous groupings. Students may be asked to respond to the lesson in different ways depending on the nature of the groupings.Title I and Special Education teachers working in an inclusion setting will pull students off to work directly to further differentiate the activities.Materials are supplied to students to support learning, where needed, particularly at the younger grade levels (i.e., math manipulatives. |
| Sheltered English immersion: Instructional content in the English language is sheltered | Teachers are expected to use best practices of SEI to support students whose first language is not English. |
| Students with disabilities: To extent observable, students with disabilities are provided with the appropriate assistive technologies, accommodations, supports, adaptations and related services | Students with disabilities are provided direct supports from Special Education teachers in both push-in and pull-out settings. Where IEPs specify, students will have access to assistive technologies, behavioral supports, and additional services provided by contracted service providers. |

# Appendix B: GVCS annual goals, 2017 to 2019

Consistent with [603 CMR 52.02](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr52.html?section=02), GCVS submitted an accountability plan to ESE, approved by the GVCS board on April 6, 2015, that articulated the goals it has set to measure success. During the February 2017 site visit, the executive director noted that the school’s accountability plan needed revision. GVCS’ board of trustees approved a new accountability plan as of December 11, 2017. The ESE approved this plan on January 30, 2018.

Provided below is the school’s assessment of whether each goal was met, not met, or no data was available, and evidence provided by the school to support this assessment.

***Accountability Goal #1*:** Ensure that the GCVS written and enacted curriculum align to the standards of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education curriculum frameworks.

***Rationale***: A move to a new learning management system and curriculum curation has changed the accountability from a pre-packaged vendor to GCVS. As a result, GCVS is responsible for ensuring that both the written and enacted curriculum align to the frameworks, with the target of ensuring mastery of competencies within said frameworks.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Annual Goals** | **2017-18** | **Evidence** |
| 1.a. Develop curriculum modules in line with Massachusetts frameworks.1.b. Review curriculum modules for adherence to curriculum frameworks and give feedback to teachers for areas of improvement. | 1a. Met1b. Not Met | 1a. School reports that in 2017-2018: Review of modules in Canvas show 90% or better scoring 3 out of 4 on the rubric.1b. School reports that in 2017-2018: Ongoing reviews do not yet show 100% of modules scoring 3 out of 4 on the rubric. |
| 2.a. Develop walk-through and clinical supervision observation protocols in line with expected online teaching practices rubric delineated by ESE2.b. Train teachers in the rubric/observation protocols2.c. Conduct observations of lessons, provide feedback, and document growth | 2a. Met2b. Met2c. Met | 2a. School reports that in 2017-2018: GVCS developed observation templates aligned with the ESE rubric on teachpoint. 2b. School reports that in 2017-2018: GVCS developed a Canvas course for educator evaluation and devoted professional development to train teachers on these protocols. 2c. School reports that in 2017-2018: observations were conducted and 90% or more staff received a proficient or higher on standards 1 and 2 of the educator evaluation rubric.  |

***Accountability Goal #2***: Develop a comprehensive assessment system and analysis protocols designed to measure and improve competencies in relation the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks, to be measured by increases in the percentage of student meeting/exceeding expectations on MCAS by closing gaps between the school’s average and the state average in all subgroups.

***Rationale***: Conditions in the GCVS certificate for improvement in student outcomes, coupled with the move to a new curriculum requires that we develop and implement a comprehensive school-based assessment system, along with measures for gathering and analyzing data for the purposes of curricular and instructional improvement.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Annual Goals** | **2017-18** | **Evidence** |
| 1.a. Get Data dashboard system into place for analysis of assessment data.1.b. Train all educators on the use of the system to inform curriculum and instruction decisions.1.c. Implement data protocols for examination of data and their impact on the teaching and learning process | 1a. Met1b. Met1c. Not Met | 1a. School reports that in 2017-2018 it purchased 4CSolutions data dashboard and populated it with available data. 1b. School reports that it held a training on March 2018 on use of data dashboard. 1c. School reports that it held an introductory training for using the Data Wise protocols in March 2018 and will continue training staff on these protocols during the 2018-19 school year.  |
| 2. Implement system for assessing student achievement in all content areas | 2. Not Met | 2. School reports that in 2017-2018 it introduced the mastery learning outcomes system in Canvas to staff, but the school needed to keep developing processes to assess all competencies in the 2018-2019 school year.  |
| 3.a. Review 2017 assessment data for trends and areas to target and as a baseline for setting measurable targets for future reviews.3.b. Implement systematic reviews of data with action plans for addressing challenges in identified standards (e.g., measurement and data, writing anchors) and increasing growth in those standards over the remainder of the term of the certificate | 3a. Met3b. Not Met | 3a. School reports that in 2017-2018 data were presented to board members, faculty, staff, and school council to show baseline data on Next Gen MCAS assessment. 3b. School reports that in 2017-2018 it introduced protocols to review data, but implementation of systems to inform instruction would be implemented by PLCs during the 2018-2019 school year.  |
| 4.a. GCVS Instructional Leadership Team will lead a study to implement changes to GCVS grading system to reflect mastery of competencies, with the goal of revising the grading system. | 4. Not Met | 4. School reports that in 2017-2018 it introduced these concepts to the school community, but work on development of competencies, rubrics, and aligning to assessments, grading system, and reports cards would take place during the 2018-2019 school year.  |
| 5. Close the percentage gap of students meeting or exceeding expectations on MCAS between local and state averages for each reportable subgroup in grades 3-8 and 10 in all areas by June 2019. Decrease the gap by 50% in 2018 and by 25% in 2019. | 5. Not Met for 2018 | 5. MCAS data show that GVCS students declined in 2018 across every subject area and grade level when compared to 2017 (with the exception of grade 10 ELA, which showed a one percent increase in proficiency in 2018). Gaps increased for the “all students” group between 2017 and 2018 results.  |

***Accountability Goal #3***: Increase faculty & staff/student/family/community engagement in the life of the school through the personalized learning and activities designed to increase input into the school.

***Rationale***: The school has experienced a history of varying degrees of engagement with families, agencies, and the broader community. Increased engagement leads to increased student learning/achievement, an overarching goal that drives this plan.

| **Action Step** | **2017-18** | **Evidence** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Engage with appropriate state/regional entities (ESE, Digital Learning Advisory Council, MAPLE Consortium, MassCUE, Superintendent Networks, Collaboratives, state legislative representatives, etc.) | 1. Met | 1. School reports that in 2017-2018, the ED attended a variety of meetings noted in the measure.  |
| 2. Engage with families/community through the establishment of a School Council as established by the Education Reform Act of 1993. | 2. Met | 2. School reports that in 2017-2018 it established a school council and it met.  |
| 3.a. Ensure 90% or more of students are engaged in live lessons and asynchronous work 3.b. Increase engagement with students and families through virtual and face-to-face outings and Learning Coach activities designed to extend/enrich the curriculum offered through the school. | 3a. Not Met3b. Met | 3a. School reports that in 2017-2018 it put structures in place to assess engagement, but did not meet 90% of engagement. 3b. School reports that in 2017-2018 it conducted virtual and face-to-face outings; some outings demonstrated 20% attendance from high school students.  |
| 4.a. Increase engagement with students through the development of personalized learning plans in grade 9.4.b. Extend the development of personalized learning plans to the middle school | 4a. Not Met4b. Not Met | 4a. School reports that in 2017-2018 personalized learning plans were developed for 75% of students in grade 9. 4b. School reports that development of personalized learning plans for middle school students will begin in the 2018-2019 school year.  |
| 5. Add blended learning possibilities for small/rural districts that enable expansion of curriculum offerings to both full- and potential part-time students. | 5. Not Met | 5. The school reports that this may be considered as part of a future amendment to the certificate.  |

# Greenfield Commonwealth Virtual School (GCVS) logoAppendix C: School’s Response to Renewal Inspection Review Report

238 Main Street 3rd Floor

Greenfield, MA 01301 [www.gcvs.org](http://www.gcvs.org/)

January 17, 2019

Phone: 413-475-3879

Fax: 413-475-3909

Email: info@gcvs.org

Alison Bagg, Office of Charter Schools and School Redesign Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education 75 Pleasant Street

Malden, MA 02148-4906

RE: Response to Accountability Review of October 18, 2018 Dear Director Bagg,

The Greenfield Commonwealth Virtual School (GCVS) acknowledges receipt of the Accountability Review Report on January 2, 2019 and wishes to extend its appreciation to the members of those who took the time to come and give us feedback on our operations. We believe that this report provides a solid roadmap for moving forward and we will be working together with stakeholders in the context of our recently revised Accountability Plan to make necessary improvements to the school. After a careful review of the report, we would like to offer the following responses. Each section of the report will be addressed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Salah Khelfaoui, Interim Executive Director

In collaboration with:

Dr. Judith Houle, Consultant to the Interim Executive Director

*Pioneering Personalized Education in Massachusetts*

*GCVS does not discriminate on the basis of race, age, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, sex, gender identity, disabilities, sexual orientation or any other protected class under the law.*

***Faithfulness to Certificate***

1. **Mission and key design elements:**

A new mission statement was adopted by the Board of Trustees in 2018 and the school’s certificate was amended to reflect that change in March 2018. The new mission statement reads as follows:

*The Greenfield Commonwealth Virtual School, a public school of choice, serves students from across Massachusetts who need a learning community that is accessible and flexible. We give our students and their families choices in what, how, when, and where they learn.*

*As a pioneer of online personalized learning, we empower our educators to tailor learning experiences to each student’s strengths, interests, and challenges. We redefine and change how students and teachers engage through innovative technology, while ensuring mastery of competencies embedded in a rigorous curriculum.*

GCVS continues to work with its marketing firm to communicate the message of the ways in which the school can personalize the educational experience of its students. Students who have been able to use the opportunities that our school has to offer to pursue lifelong dreams (particularly athletic and artistic pursuits) have been highlighted on the school’s website and through social media.

GCVS has been working with staff and the Board of Trustees to implement competency-based, personalized learning as an overarching framework with several components that will comprise the steps to a full realization of strong learning outcomes, coupled with student agency and voice. Teachers are identifying competencies for learning and aligning instruction, assessment, and feedback practices to be more specific and meaningful. To that end, the school has implemented a data dashboard to warehouse data from a variety of sources. This will be the first of several steps to map data from assessments to standards, revise our student/family report card system to a standards-based model, and to explore the ramifications of moving in this direction on instructional practice. GCVS has also joined the International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL, https://[www.inacol.org/),](http://www.inacol.org/%29) which serves as a clearinghouse for competency-based education and offers a number of resources to our faculty and administration, of which we are beginning to take advantage as we begin to reshape our work. In October 2018, our Director of Teaching and Learning and the three grade level Team Leaders attended their annual Symposium and brought back information to the rest of the faculty with regard to the national work in this area.

The GCVS Board of Trustees approved a new accountability plan on December 11, 2017, which was revised after receiving feedback, and approved by ESE in March 2018 as a certificate amendment. This, along with this accountability report, will provide a roadmap for necessary improvements to the school.

The work of the faculty to curate content and resources within our Canvas Learning Management System in alignment with the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks is continuing on as the school is now in its second year of this system. Informed by the enactment of the curriculum in year 1, teachers have worked to strengthen the learning modules within Canvas to ensure that the standards are fully met.

1. **Access and equity**

GCVS has established a School Council, consisting of two administrators (Executive Director and Director of Teaching and Learning), three faculty representatives (one each from elementary, middle, and high school), a high school student representative, and two parents. The Council’s role is in accordance with the Education Reform Act of 1993, providing input to the school on its operations. Our SEPAC, working with our Director of Student Services, is a vibrant community of stakeholders who are providing feedback on our programming in that regard.

GCVS acknowledges that we need to strengthen our programming for ELs. We have hired a consulting two ESL teachers who are working to build curriculum content in our Canvas LMS to support EL students, working with teachers on instructional supports, and providing direct services as needed.

***Academic and Program Success***

1. **Student performance**

GCVS conducted an analysis of the MCAS results in the fall of 2018. Issues persist with regard to overall achievement and the closing of achievement gaps in our subgroups. As the curriculum alignment process continues, we are confident that this will help us move forward in that regard.

During the process of content curation within Canvas, we found that the new curriculum, most especially mathematics, is more rigorous than the prior curriculum from our all-in-one provider. Our upper elementary teachers reported that they have had to fill skill gaps and parents have reported that the new math curriculum is more rigorous and challenging as well. We believe that it will take a couple of years for us to meet state averages for proficiency or higher, but we believe that we are on the path to realizing this goal with the understanding that our small sample size can have some impact on those numbers.

Another area of impact on our student performance is student engagement. We noted anecdotally in 2018 that approximately 20% of our students and families were not fully engaged in the school and meeting our expectations for live lesson attendance and successful completion of asynchronous assignments. As a result, the school’s Accountability Plan is focused on engaging with stakeholders and, in particular, with families. The FY19 budget included funding for an extra Family Engagement Coordinator and an increase in the School Nurse from 0.8 to 1.0 FTE. An Engagement Team with a staff Team Leader was established and includes the Nurse, the 3 Family Engagement Coordinators, and the two High School Guidance Counselors who meet weekly to discuss ways to better engage with families and intervene more intensely with those who are not meeting these expectations.

GCVS also purchased a plug-in for Canvas called Dropout Detective, from AspireEDU. This tool pulls data from several points within the LMS and presents them as risk factors for students. The data are pulled daily and include a trend analysis to determine risk levels and interventions needed.

1. **Program delivery – Curriculum**

As the school entered into year 2 of its implementation of the Canvas LMS and curated curriculum, teachers are refining instructional units to ensure alignment with the Massachusetts Frameworks. The Senior Leadership Team continues to monitor this work along with the alignment of assessments to competencies. This provides a beginning step toward better vertical alignment as we move to a competency-based, personalized learning model.

1. **Program delivery – Instruction**

GCVS is continuing its work in the area of understanding and implementing high-impact instructional practices based on the work of John Hattie, author of several works detailing meta-analyses of 1,400 studies involving the impact of instruction of over 300 million students ([http://visiblelearningplus.com/content/250-influences-student-achievement).](http://visiblelearningplus.com/content/250-influences-student-achievement%29) A fall professional development session focused on practices that have shown to be ones with impacts that can increase student growth in learning at a rate of one year or better over a year’s worth of time. Time has been allotted at faculty meetings for follow-up on these practices and evaluators are observing lessons for evidence of implementation and giving feedback to teachers on how to improve their practice.

1. **Program delivery – Assessment and program evaluation**

GCVS is currently using a data dashboard. Using Tableau Reader as the backbone, 4CSolutions has taken our MCAS, DIBELS, CBM, Lexia, and Benchmark Assessment System data and brought them together in one dashboard that allows for school-wide, grade-level wide, teacher-specific, and student-specific data that is easy to visualize and allows teachers and administrators to examine the data, looking for overall trends within the data, as well as drill down to individual students in order to provide systematic and individual supports.

As part of our professional development work, the Director of Teaching and Learning has provided training in the use of data protocols, stemming from the DataWise project at Harvard University.

Teachers are using an inquiry-based approach in their teams to analyze the data they have, what they mean, and how they can use them to improve instruction.

Teachers are currently mapping course assessments to competencies within the Canvas LMS. As data are being populated, teachers can access a data dashboard within Canvas to look at trends within their classes to determine who may be ready to move on or move into more enrichment activities as well as those who will require additional support to master the content. These progress monitoring measures, coupled with benchmark data, and observations of practice will serve as a springboard to increase the examination of practices that should be changed or improved in order to increase student learning and, as a result, improve achievement levels on all data measures implemented by the school.

1. **Program delivery – Diverse learners**

GCVS recognizes that this is an area of struggle for the school that needs to be addressed. As noted in the report, the new LMS has afforded teachers expanded opportunities to support student learning who are eligible for accommodations under these plans. The school’s Student Intervention Team (SIT) has also become an integral part of the life of the school. Processes were more clearly defined during the spring of 2017 and have been implemented with meetings taking place on an almost weekly basis.

Students who are concerning to the staff are brought forward and plans made to implement interventions, which are part of a check-in process with the SIT.

We acknowledge our need to increase supports in place for our ELs, which is an area in which we need to work vigorously to ensure that our ELE program is more robust. As noted above, ESL teachers have been hired and are working with the Director of Students Services and the faculty to ensure proper identification, assessment, and services delivery for our EL students.

We are currently at a 6% higher rate of students with disabilities as part of our population versus the state. As we continue to grow in this area, we have added new staff and reorganized staff responsibilities to ensure that we are doing all we can at Tier 3, including additional 1:1 supports and the establishment of some substantially separate classes for those students who need that level of support.

***Organizational Viability***

1. **Capacity – School leadership**

As noted in the report, the school leadership has stabilized after a year of significant turmoil. The relationship between the Board of Trustees and Executive Director has truly become a collaborative one. Taking on all the operations of the school caused us to add staff (Enrollment and Data Specialist, Administrative Assistant for Data and Business Services) and to take on the job of ensuring that our students were receiving the materials necessary to learn. This included procurement and shipment of student computers as well as additional materials requested by teachers to ensure students had the hands-on items needed to fully engage with the curriculum.

In the summer of 2018, Dr. Judith Houle announced her intent to retire from public school administration by the end of the calendar year. The Board of Trustees hired Dr. Salah Khelfaoui as Interim Executive Director for the remainder of the 2018-19 school year, as they await the ESE’s decision on the renewal of the school’s certificate. Dr. Houle has been hired as a consultant to Dr. Khelfaoui and the school to ensure a seamless transition and positive trajectory moving forward. At its next meeting on February 11, the Board of Trustees will decide on how to proceed for a permanent executive Director conditional on the outcome of its certificate renewal decision.

As a part of our restructuring, several avenues have been put in place to share decisions among stakeholders. As noted in the report, these include our Senior Leadership Team (administrators), Instructional Leadership Team (administrators and Team Leaders), and our School Council. In addition to the Board of Trustees, information is shared across these groups and decisions made at the appropriate level with feedback from all stakeholder groups. Weekly team meetings and monthly faculty meetings ensure that open dialogue remains in place.

1. **Capacity – Professional climate**

As noted above, the organizational structure at GCVS is designed to bring the whole school together on a more frequent basis to address the issues that need attention. A key component of these gatherings at all levels is to increase the discourse around curriculum, instruction, assessment, and engagement in a problem-solving model. As team time is becoming more aligned with the principles of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), three driving forces, adapted from the work of Chris Sturgis, have become the overarching focus of these gatherings:

* 1. We accept learning as the fundamental purpose of our school and therefore are willing to examine all practices in light of their impact on learning.
	2. We are committed to working together to achieve our collective purpose. We cultivate a collaborative culture through the development of high-performing teams.
	3. We assess our effectiveness on the basis of results rather than intentions. Individuals, teams, and schools seek relevant data and information and use that information to promote continuous improvement.
1. **Governance**

The Senior Leadership Team and Board of Trustees are in year two of a new budget process, which brought increased transparency to the budget, tying together the various revenue sources (school choice, special education increment, and grants) to expenditures in ways that provided more clarity and understanding. This process also allows for better trend analysis and examination of how to best use the various sources of funding the school receives. The Board has established a Budget Ad Hoc Committee to work most closely with the Senior Leadership Team on financial oversight and management of the school’s funds.

A Policy Ad hoc Committee has been formed to review the school’s policy manual, which does not sufficiently address the overall operations of the school, and to recommend additional policies or revise current ones to ensure that the school is running efficiently and well. They hope to complete their work by the end of this school year.

**Summary**

This school year has proven to be an extraordinary one for GCVS. The process of redefining who we are and how we deliver a quality online educational program to our students has been arduous, iterative, and rewarding. We are grateful to the members of the site visit team for their thorough, thoughtful review and feedback. This report has provided us with clear guidance on the steps we need to take, moving forward.

We would also like to take this opportunity to thank Interim Commissioner Wulfson, Commissioner Riley, and the members of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education for your continued support of online education for students who are in need of this alternative, most especially for the increase in funding that will help us further strengthen the school and our work. We look forward to our continued partnership with DESE in this endeavor.

**Response to assessment of GCVS Accountability Plan Goals for 2017-19**

We appreciate the feedback received on the progress of GCVS in achieving the goals of its accountability plan. However, we feel some further explanation of our progress is necessary. While the plan was written to cover the last 2+ years of the school’s certificate, the process of approvals was such that the plan has been fully approved for less than a year at this point. To that end, we wish to clarify some areas that were deemed as not met below. We also see this plan as one that is aimed at June 2019, therefore, many of the items deemed not met are actually in progress with our attention focused on assessing their status in June 2019.

***Accountability Goal #1*:** Ensure that the GCVS written and enacted curriculum align to the standards of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education curriculum frameworks.

***Rationale***: A move to a new learning management system and curriculum curation has changed the accountability from a pre-packaged vendor to GCVS. As a result, GCVS is responsible for ensuring that both the written and enacted curriculum align to the frameworks, with the target of ensuring mastery of competencies within said frameworks.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Annual Goals** | **2017-18** | **Evidence** |
| * 1. Develop curriculum modules in line with Massachusetts frameworks.
	2. Review curriculum modules for adherence to curriculum frameworks and give feedback to teachers for areas of improvement.
 | 1a. Met1b. Not Met | 1a. School reports that in 2017-2018: Review of modules in Canvas show 90% or better scoring 3 out of 4 on the rubric.1b. School reports that in 2017-2018: Ongoing reviews do not yet show 100% of modules scoring 3 out of 4 on the rubric. |
| * 1. Develop walk-through and clinical supervision observation protocols in line with expected online teaching practices rubric delineated by ESE
	2. Train teachers in the rubric/observation protocols
	3. Conduct observations of lessons, provide feedback, and document growth
 | 2a. Met2b. Met2c. Met | 2a. School reports that in 2017-2018: GVCS developed observation templates aligned with the ESE rubric on Teachpoint.2b. School reports that in 2017-2018: GVCS developed a Canvas course for educator evaluation and devoted professional development to train teachers on these protocols.2c. School reports that in 2017-2018: observations were conducted and 90% or more staff received a proficient or higher on standards 1 and 2 of the educator evaluation rubric. |

**GCVS Response:**

While we have met most of the action items associated with this goal, we feel that action item #1b has been partially met. Most of the curriculum modules have been shown to meet the criteria used to measure that alignment. Where they were deemed to have not fully met the requirements, teachers have been given feedback on what they can do to strengthen the modules. Additionally, teachers are using data from the first year of implementation to revise modules and assessments this year to ensure that the students are able to demonstrate mastery of the standards therein.

***Accountability Goal #2***: Develop a comprehensive assessment system and analysis protocols designed to measure and improve competencies in relation the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks, to be measured by increases in the percentage of student meeting/exceeding expectations on MCAS by closing gaps between the school’s average and the state average in all subgroups.

***Rationale***: Conditions in the GCVS certificate for improvement in student outcomes, coupled with the move to a new curriculum requires that we develop and implement a comprehensive school-based assessment system, along with measures for gathering and analyzing data for the purposes of curricular and instructional improvement.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Annual Goals** | **2017-18** | **Evidence** |
| * 1. Get Data dashboard system into place for analysis of assessment data.
	2. Train all educators on the use of the system to inform curriculum and instruction decisions.
	3. Implement data protocols for examination of data and their impact on the teaching and learning process
 | 1a. Met1b. Met1c. Not Met | 1a. School reports that in 2017-2018 it purchased 4CSolutions data dashboard and populated it with available data.1b. School reports that it held a training on March 2018 on use of data dashboard.1c. School reports that it held an introductory training for using the Data Wise protocols in March 2018 and will continue training staff on these protocols during the 2018-19 school year. |
| 2. Implement system for assessing student achievement in all content areas | 2. Not Met | 2. School reports that in 2017-2018 it introduced the mastery learning outcomes system in Canvas to staff, but the school needed to keep developing processes to assess all competencies in the 2018-2019 school year. |
| 3.a. Review 2017 assessment data for trends and areas to target and as a baseline for setting measurable targets for future reviews. | 3a. Met | 3a. School reports that in 2017-2018 data were presented to board members, faculty, staff, and school council to show baseline data on Next Gen MCAS assessment. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Annual Goals** | **2017-18** | **Evidence** |
| 3.b. Implement systematic reviews of data with action plans for addressing challenges in identified standards (e.g., measurement and data, writing anchors) and increasing growth in those standards over the remainder of the term of the certificate | 3b. Not Met | 3b. School reports that in 2017-2018 it introduced protocols to review data, but implementation of systems to inform instruction would be implemented by PLCs during the 2018- 2019 school year. |
| 4.a. GCVS Instructional Leadership Team will lead a study to implement changes to GCVS grading system to reflect mastery of competencies, with the goal of revising the grading system. | 4. Not Met | 4. School reports that in 2017-2018 it introduced these concepts to the school community, but work on development of competencies, rubrics, and aligning to assessments, grading system, and reports cards would take place during the 2018-2019 school year. |
| 5. Close the percentage gap of students meeting or exceeding expectations on MCAS between local and state averages for each reportable subgroup in grades 3-8 and 10 in all areas by June 2019. Decrease the gap by 50% in 2018 and by 25% in 2019. | 5. Not Met for 2018 | 5. MCAS data show that GVCS students declined in 2018 across every subject area and grade level when compared to 2017 (with the exception of grade 10 ELA, which showed a one percent increase in proficiency in 2018). Gaps increased for the “all students” group between 2017 and 2018 results. |

**GCVS Response:**

Action item 1c, in the school’s view, is partially met. At the time of the visit, an initial training of staff on the data dashboard and Datawise protocols had been completed. The process of using protocols to analyze data, reflect on their meaning, and use them to improve both asynchronous curriculum and live lesson instruction is ongoing. The grade level and engagement teams have established times to engage in this work as PLCs.

Action item 2 is in progress. Teachers were paid stipends for summer assessment work after training on competency-based education and measuring outcomes held in June 2018. Teachers met in K-12 vertical teams to determine the competencies they would measure based on the Massachusetts standards. These competencies were uploaded into Canvas and the teachers have been working continuously throughout this year to align their assessments with the competencies they have determined as critical to student success. Our goal is to have the initial work completed by June 2019 and to begin to use the data generated to further inform curriculum and instruction.

Action item 3b is also a work in progress. The target, as stated above, in the plan is to work toward a June 2019 date of completion. The evidence cited by the site visit team are active steps the school is taking this year.

Action item 4 has been partially met. The faculty have been trained in the principles of competency-based, personalized learning; have identified competencies that will be assessed within Canvas and have begun the process of mapping course assessments to those competencies. That work will, in turn, result in data in Canvas that will assist teachers in tracking students’ progress toward mastery. Discussions of how this will impact grading practices and what changes need to be made is in its early stages and will continue throughout the remainder of the school year.

GCVS acknowledges that action item 5 has not been met and is fully aware of the work that lies ahead to meet this challenging goal. As noted above, this involves a focus on engagement as well as academics to achieve.

***Accountability Goal #3***: Increase faculty & staff/student/family/community engagement in the life of the school through the personalized learning and activities designed to increase input into the school.

***Rationale***: The school has experienced a history of varying degrees of engagement with families, agencies, and the broader community. Increased engagement leads to increased student learning/achievement, an overarching goal that drives this plan.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Action Step** | **2017-18** | **Evidence** |
| 1. Engage with appropriate state/regional entities (ESE, Digital Learning Advisory Council, MAPLE Consortium, MassCUE, Superintendent Networks, Collaboratives, state legislative representatives, etc.) | 1. Met | 1. School reports that in 2017-2018, the ED attended a variety of meetings noted in the measure. |
| 2. Engage with families/community through the establishment of a School Council as established by the Education Reform Act of 1993. | 2. Met | 2. School reports that in 2017- 2018 it established a school council and it met. |
| * 1. Ensure 90% or more of students are engaged in live lessons and asynchronous work
	2. Increase engagement with students and families through virtual and face-to-face outings and Learning Coach activities designed to extend/enrich the curriculum offered through the school.
 | 3a. Not Met 3b. Met | 3a. School reports that in 2017-2018 it put structures in place to assess engagement but did not meet 90% of engagement.3b. School reports that in 2017-2018 it conducted virtual and face-to-face outings; some outings demonstrated 20% attendance from high school students. |
| * 1. Increase engagement with students through the development of personalized learning plans in grade 9.
	2. Extend the development of personalized learning plans to the middle school
 | 4a. Not Met4b. Not Met | 4a. School reports that in 2017-2018 personalized learning plans were developed for 75% of students in grade 9.4b. School reports that development of personalized learning plans for middle school students will begin in the 2018-2019 school year. |
| 5. Add blended learning possibilities for small/rural districts that enable expansion of curriculum offerings to both full- and potential part-time students. | 5. Not Met | 5. The school reports that this may be considered as part of a future amendment to the certificate. |

**GCVS Response:**

Action item 3a was not met in 2017-18, as the school did not have the resources to work toward that end. With the increase in per pupil funding, starting in FY19, staffing was increased in this area and a monitoring system for asynchronous engagement in Canvas was purchased. With these resources in hand, the school is working to find ways to meet this goal through targeted interventions with Learning Coaches and students who are not meeting the school’s requirements for engagement.

Action items 4a and 4b were in the early stages of implementation at the time of the site visit. During the 2017-18 school year, GCVS used a school-generated form to work with students on personalized learning plans. This was a laborious process that did not result in a database that would allow for careful monitoring. In the fall of 2018, GCVS purchased Naviance for its high school guidance counselors to use in creating personalized learning plans for high school students, as well as a way to help them move toward college and career goals. The license that was purchased also included middle school students, so they could create personalized learning plans. This system allows GCVS to gather data on these plans and better track students’ progress toward achieving them.

Action item 5 has been one that the Board of Trustees has expressed a great interest in achieving as a school. Due to the geographic area in which the administrative offices are housed, they see a possibility for an affordable solution that could be offered to small, rural districts for blended learning that could help them increase their collective capacity for offering more options to their students. The Board realizes that this possibility hinges on the school’s certificate being renewed and has decided to pursue this as an amendment to a new certificate, should one be granted.

1. Membership in focus groups was not mutually exclusive. Members were solicited by school leadership. Focus groups were largely conducted via teleconference. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)