Lavilla School Of The Arts

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lavilla School Of The Arts

501 N DAVIS ST, Jacksonville, FL 32202

http://www.duvalschools.org/lavilla

Demographics

Principal: Lianna Knight M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	50%
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: A (68%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (66%) 2014-15: A (77%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here]().	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the 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

Lavilla School Of The Arts

501 N DAVIS ST, Jacksonville, FL 32202

http://www.duvalschools.org/lavilla

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	34%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

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.

The mission of LaVilla School of the Arts is to prepare our students to meet the high quality academic and pre-professional arts curricula at the high school level; to nurture knowledgeable life-long supporters of the arts; and to provide in-school and out-of-school opportunities that enhance creativity, aesthetic and critical thinking skills, self-discipline, leadership, teamwork, and an appreciation for cultural diversity

Provide the school's vision statement.

LaVilla School of the Arts will prepare all students to achieve success in the arts and academics.

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
Knight, Lianna	Principal	Instructional Leader
Bacon, Joan	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Jackson, Morgan	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair
Blumberg, Christianne	Teacher, ESE	Push in support for ELA and Professional Development Facilitator
Martin, Donnie	Teacher, K-12	Testing Coordinator

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	349	362	302	0	0	0	0	1013
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	19	15	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	42	35	0	0	0	0	130

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	10
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)

59

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/30/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

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

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

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

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	75%	43%	54%	72%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	49%	54%	61%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	45%	47%	51%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	72%	49%	58%	70%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	59%	50%	57%	63%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	47%	51%	54%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	70%	44%	51%	74%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	88%	68%	72%	85%	65%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	349 (0)	362 (0)	302 (0)	1013 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	16 ()	19 ()	15 ()	50 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	53 (0)	42 (0)	35 (0)	130 (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
06	2019	71%	47%	24%	54%	17%
	2018	72%	44%	28%	52%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	78%	44%	34%	52%	26%
	2018	68%	41%	27%	51%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	77%	49%	28%	56%	21%
	2018	79%	51%	28%	58%	21%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	62%	51%	11%	55%	7%
	2018	63%	42%	21%	52%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	77%	47%	30%	54%	23%
	2018	78%	50%	28%	54%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	19%	32%	-13%	46%	-27%
	2018	42%	31%	11%	45%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	70%	40%	30%	48%	22%
	2018	73%	44%	29%	50%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	67%	-67%	67%	-67%
2018	75%	63%	12%	65%	10%
Compare		-75%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	88%	69%	19%	71%	17%
2018	98%	84%	14%	71%	27%
Compare		-10%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	89%	57%	32%	61%	28%
2018	98%	61%	37%	62%	36%
Compare		-9%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%
2018	100%	57%	43%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	51	52	47	35	41	29	36	59	57		
ELL	57	60		64	40						
ASN	91	66		88	53		75	100	100		
BLK	57	55	46	54	49	37	52	76	85		
HSP	85	67	71	74	60	48	72	94	80		
MUL	81	63	54	79	46		71	89	93		
WHT	83	68	60	82	66	47	79	94	89		
FRL	65	59	47	62	52	35	58	78	76		
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
SWD	47	55	56	44	57	50	52	100	95		
ASN	73	68		81	68			100	100		
BLK	55	53	45	54	49	40	48	97	88		
HSP	84	59	67	73	57	70	88	100	95		
MUL	74	68		85	50	50	69	100	100		
WHT	82	60	53	84	65	54	87	98	90		
FRL	60	50	42	61	53	45	61	97	88		
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
SWD	50	44	32	40	43	37	53	52	100		

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
ASN	87	73		87	67			100			
BLK	55	54	49	52	56	51	58	72	94		
HSP	77	62	47	63	55	41	65	96	81		
MUL	73	48		69	65	58	83	83	100		
WHT	82	67	59	82	69	61	83	92	89		
FRL	60	55	50	60	55	49	69	76	93		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	609
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	72
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	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	74
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	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

Math Lowest 25th Percentile

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

Social Studies Achievement

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.

Math Lowest 25th Percentile

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

ELA Learning Gains

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

Level 1 on statewide assessment at a total of 130

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

1. Math Bottom Quartile
2. Social Studies Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Bottom Quartile Gains
Rationale	Our math bottom quartile gains dropped from 48% to 41% last school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to increase Math Bottom Quartile Gains to 48%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The administrative team, along with the Prealgebra and Enrichment teachers, will use multiple types of student assessment data to guide instructional decisions, as well as to create individual student plans of support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe that if data is constantly monitored and strategies are individually tailored, students will show growth.
Action Step	
Description	1. Pull previous FSA levels and iReady data. 2. Create student target groups. 3. Work with students in small, teacher led groups. 4. Review and analyze student data. 5. Repeat
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2	
Title	Social Studies Proficiency
Rationale	Our Social Studies proficiency dropped from 98% to 88%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to increase Social Studies proficiency to 90%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The administrative team, along with the Civics teachers, will use multiple types of student assessment data to guide instructional decisions, as well as to create individual student plans of support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe that if data is constantly monitored and strategies are individually tailored, students will show growth. We also plan to constantly work on improving reading lexiles.
Action Step	
Description	1. Pull previous FSA levels and iReady data. 2. Create student target groups. 3. Work with students in small, teacher led groups. 4. Review and analyze student data. 5. Repeat
Person Responsible	Lianna Knight (knightl2@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).

Our math learning gains will increase as a result of the bottom quartile gains.