

Duval County Public Schools

Duval Virtual Instruction Academy



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Duval Virtual Instruction Academy

7000 POWERS AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32217

<http://www.duvalschools.org/dvia>

Demographics

Principal: Mark Ertel E

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: I (%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: I (%) 2015-16: C (47%) 2014-15: I (%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Duval Virtual Instruction Academy

7000 POWERS AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32217

<http://www.duvalschools.org/dvia>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	13%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	I	C	I	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Engaging students in a 21st century, virtual learning environment for a lifetime of success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Onward Online - Students succeeding in Their World."

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ertel, Mark	Principal	
Elkins, Dawn	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	12	5	4	5	5	6	17	14	19	19	26	28	25	185
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	4	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	4	4	4	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	3	5	1	1	15

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

185

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	1	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	2	5	6	1	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	4	5	1	0	19

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	54%	61%	0%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	56%	59%	0%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	53%	54%	0%	47%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	57%	62%	0%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	57%	59%	0%	52%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	52%	0%	46%	50%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement	0%	50%	56%	0%	47%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	76%	78%	0%	76%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	12 (0)	5 (0)	4 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	6 (0)	17 (0)	14 (0)	19 (0)	19 (0)	26 (0)	28 (0)	25 (0)	185 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	0 ()	2 ()	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	2 ()	0 ()	4 ()	10 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	15 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	5 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	15 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	51%	-51%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	73%	50%	23%	56%	17%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		73%				
Cohort Comparison		73%				
06	2019	59%	47%	12%	54%	5%
	2018	53%	44%	9%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		59%				
07	2019	74%	44%	30%	52%	22%
	2018	61%	41%	20%	51%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		21%				
08	2019	100%	49%	51%	56%	44%
	2018	68%	51%	17%	58%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		32%				
Cohort Comparison		39%				
09	2019	63%	48%	15%	55%	8%
	2018	58%	48%	10%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
10	2019	56%	48%	8%	53%	3%
	2018	55%	49%	6%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	64%	-64%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	40%	57%	-17%	60%	-20%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		40%				
Cohort Comparison		40%				
06	2019	65%	51%	14%	55%	10%
	2018	45%	42%	3%	52%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		65%				
07	2019	57%	47%	10%	54%	3%
	2018	61%	50%	11%	54%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
08	2019	0%	32%	-32%	46%	-46%
	2018	60%	31%	29%	45%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-60%				
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	73%	49%	24%	53%	20%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		73%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	58%	40%	18%	48%	10%
	2018	64%	44%	20%	50%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		58%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	67%	8%	67%	8%
2018	62%	63%	-1%	65%	-3%
Compare		13%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	69%	5%	71%	3%
2018	67%	84%	-17%	71%	-4%
Compare		7%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	87%	68%	19%	70%	17%
2018	70%	64%	6%	68%	2%
Compare		17%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	57%	4%	61%	0%
2018	56%	61%	-5%	62%	-6%
Compare		5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	61%	9%	57%	13%
2018	52%	57%	-5%	56%	-4%
Compare		18%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	31	33									
BLK	61	52		50	40					82	
HSP	80										
WHT	71	54	36	61	47		77			85	41
FRL	50	45		21	8					71	10
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
BLK	46	48		41	38						
WHT	64	39		58	48		75			77	42
FRL	50	42		50	35					70	
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	474
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	92%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	80
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

5th grade Math showed the lowest performance of all subgroups. Our curriculum provider had a new product that did not function properly. Although the content was aligned to State Standards, the accessibility was limited and caused many students to miss critical components of instruction.

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

Grade 7 Math showed the greatest decline from the prior year. However, our score is ranked 13 of 50 total schools that received a score in our district, which is the top 26% of our district.

Individual Student Data reflects the following:

3 of 22 students scored Level 1

1 student did not earn a score

We will continue to focus on instruction in content standards. We will continue to offer help to identified students through tutoring and ramp up sessions differentiated as needed for individual students.

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

School data is pending the State's approval of a school grade waiver. Once received, the State will post the data to the system.

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

ELA Achievement and ELA Learning Gains both showed the largest improvement with 10 and 12 point gains respectively. ELA Achievement is also 8 points higher than the state average. Our ELA department implemented a series of Boot Camp sessions designed to differentiate instruction for our lowest performing students in their areas of greatest need.

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

The school-wide AAIT (Academic and Attendance Intervention Team) will follow established protocols of the AAIT process and monitor all students, including EWS students and all others, as well.

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

1. Increase the percent of students tested from 92% to 95%.
2. Increase Math Achievement from 54% to 62% to match the state average.
3. Increase Math Learning Gains from 44% to 57% to match the district average.
4. Earn Social Studies Achievement points at district average or higher.
5. Maintain ELA Achievement; not dropping below the state or district average.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase percent of students tested from 92% to 95%.
Rationale	The percent tested needs to equate to a minimum of 95% in order to earn a School Grade.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	95% of eligible students tested.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mark Ertel (ertelm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using multiple means of communication and verification of enrollment status, and required assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This strategy allows for the most means of communication and explanation of requirements to the highest number of stakeholders.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identification of appropriate students to receive communications. 2. Conduct notifications via telephone, email and messaging systems at appropriate intervals throughout the testing season.
Person Responsible	Mark Ertel (ertelm@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Increase Math achievement from 54% to 62%.
Rationale	Math achievement needs to equal or exceed the State average.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The school plans to achieve 62% proficiency in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mark Ertel (ertelm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will conduct tutoring and ramp up sessions for all students who fall below level 3 at appropriate intervals, increasing in frequency throughout the school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In the 18-19 school year, the majority of students who were low performing and attended the sessions, performed at higher proficiency than in prior years.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Offer differentiated tutoring/instructional sessions for all struggling students in both physical and virtual environments. 2. Plan boot camp/ramp up sessions for high impact instruction as needed for small groups of students.. 3. Conduct boot camp/ramp up sessions to coincide with the testing season. 4. Offer incentives for student participation to encourage students to attend.
Person Responsible	Mark Ertel (ertelm@duvalschools.org)
#3	
Title	Increase Math Learning Gains from 44% to 57% to match the district average.
Rationale	Math Learning Gains need to equal or exceed the district average.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The school plans to increase Learning Gains to 57% in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mark Ertel (ertelm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will conduct tutoring and ramp up sessions for all students who fall below level 3 at appropriate intervals, increasing in frequency throughout the school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In the 18-19 school year, the majority of students who were low performing and attended the sessions, performed at higher proficiency than in prior years.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Offer differentiated tutoring/instructional sessions for all struggling students in both physical and virtual environments. 2. Plan boot camp/ramp up sessions for high impact instruction as needed for small groups of students.. 3. Conduct boot camp/ramp up sessions to coincide with the testing season. 4. Offer incentives for student participation to encourage students to attend.
Person Responsible	Dawn Elkins (elkinsd@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase percent of students tested from 92% to 95%.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Math achievement from 54% to 62%.	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Math Learning Gains from 44% to 57% to match the district average.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00