

Duval County Public Schools

Duval Virtual Instruction Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

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: 8/3/2015

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
2019-20 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%)
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 is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	15%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	I	I	C	I

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/3/2015, Mark Ertel E

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

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/3/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

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%
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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%				
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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

DVIA has implemented a requirement for students to take all State required assessments or they are not allowed to return to the school the following year. With that said, this year's significant enrollment increase will be a further challenge to test all required students.

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

Seventh grade Science. The overall achievement level was high and well above the district and state. However, the decline will be addressed as we revisit the curriculum for that grade level.

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.

Fifth grade math. We will address by a change in teachers.

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

8th grade ELA. Internal review found only that the student population changed

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

This year, considering our significantly increased enrollments, the Level 1 students will be a focus area.

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

1. dealing with the tenfold increase in student enrollments
2. focusing on the needs of ESE students
3. focusing on the needs of Level 1 students
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	increase teacher staffing to accommodate increased enrollments
Measurable Outcome:	to ensure the ratio of teacher-to-student is within normal operations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mark Ertel (ertelm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Best practices in hiring
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESE support
Measurable Outcome:	use of common and acceptable ESE strategies
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dawn Elkins (elkinsd@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Significant number of new teachers needing PD on virtual instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	knowledge and understanding of virtual instruction
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dawn Elkins (elkinsd@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Edgenuity training and PD on how to facilitate learning in the virtual setting.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

- Increase staffing to accommodate increased enrollments.**
- Training of new staff to the world of virtual instruction.**
- Assign teachers in areas of strength.**
- Hire additional ESE certificated teachers.**

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

DVIA is very proud of our school culture. Our 5-Essentials data supports our approach of transparency and inclusion of all constituents.

The 5Essentials Performance
 Collaborative Teachers
 96
 Very Strong
 Involved Families
 95

Very Strong
 Effective Leaders
 85
 Very Strong
 Supportive Environment
 78
 Strong
 Ambitious Instruction
 63
 Strong

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Teacher Recruitment and Retention	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00