

Duval County Public Schools

Lavilla School Of The Arts



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	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

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: 7/30/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
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: A (68%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (66%)
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 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	22

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	30%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

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.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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 and Gifted Lead
Blumberg, Christianne	Teacher, ESE	Push in support for ELA and Professional Development Facilitator
Martin, Donnie	Teacher, K-12	Testing Coordinator
Sheard, Karen	School Counselor	School Counselor for grade 6 and A-L grade 7
Brown, William	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/30/2020, Lianna Knight M

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

59

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
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: A (68%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (66%)
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 .	

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	338	341	324	0	0	0	0	1003	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	11	0	0	0	0	37	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	21	9	0	0	0	0	44	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	25	12	0	0	0	0	58	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	20	13	0	0	0	0	54	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	31	20	0	0	0	0	81	
	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		

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	25	37	24	0	0	0	0	86	

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	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	6	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/30/2020

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	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	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	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		

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	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	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	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		

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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(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
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%
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%

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

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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		
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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
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%	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	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	72
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	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	74
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	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

Lowest Performing Math Gains, 41%

We had a teacher that did not teach the standards and hold students accountable for learning.

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

Lowest Performing Math Gains, 41%

We had a teacher that did not teach the standards and hold students accountable for learning.

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.

Needs to be completed

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

Reading Gains, 63%

We increased 5 percentage points in this area. We had a focus on grade-level standards and emphasized grade-level texts in our Reading classes.

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

The number of course failures in math and the number of level 1s on the Math State Assessment.

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

1. Increasing Lowest Performing Math Gains
2. Increasing Math Gains
3. Increasing Acceleration
4. Decrease the number of course failures in math
5. Decrease the number of level 1s on the Math State Assessment

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: In schools with strong Student-Teacher Trust, students and teachers share a high level of mutual trust and respect. This goal was derived from the 5Essential Survey and identified as the weakest measure from our results.

Measurable Outcome: Administrators plan to see the 5Essential Measure, Supportive Environment, move from a weak status to neutral. We also expect to see more students feel as if their teachers treat them with respect.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: The Positive Behavior Intervention Team will facilitate professional development for teachers to ensure we foster safe, caring and respectful learning environments for our students. This professional development will target student behavior, problem-solving strategies and biases, as well as build teamwork and community.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: As expressed in the 5Essentials survey, our Student-Teacher Trust is the weakest measure. Our students feel as if they are not treated with respect and are not heard by their teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

Our PBIS Team will share the results from the 5Essential Survey to our teachers during a faculty meeting.

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

The PBIS Team will provide professional development activities with our faculty that address insights into their behavior, problem-solving strategies and biases, as well as build teamwork and community. We will also read an article and collaborate on Equitable Classroom Practices.

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Our faculty will be charged with implementing one of these activities with their students for the entire nine weeks.

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Our PBIS Team will facilitate a faculty debriefing of the consistent activity and next steps.

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

The PBIS team will take a student survey after the first nine weeks to see if the activities and practices put in place increase student to teacher trust.

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Based off of the results from the student survey, we will revisit our activities or continue to implement the community-building and trust activities in the classrooms.

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In schools with strong Instructional Leadership, the leadership team is an active and skilled group that sets high standards for teaching and student learning. This area of focus was derived from the 5Essential Survey. This measure dropped 12 points from last year specifically in the areas of providing teachers with useful professional development and meaningful walkthrough feedback.

Measurable Outcome: Administrators plan to see the 5Essential Measure, Instructional Leadership, move from a neutral status to strong. We also expect to see teachers feeling strongly about the administrative team providing them with useful feedback to improve their teaching.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: William Brown (brownw2@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Administrators will facilitate PLCs where teachers will identify the strategies they feel would best support them in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: As expressed in the results from the 5Essentials survey, the number of teachers feeling as if the administrative team provided them with useful and meaningful feedback decreased from 53% to 47%.

Action Steps to Implement

Administrators will share the results of the 5Essentials survey with PLCs, specifically in the area of Effective Leaders.

Person Responsible William Brown (brownw2@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will identify strategies, professional development opportunities, and protocols that they feel would best increase their teaching practices.

Person Responsible William Brown (brownw2@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will conduct rounds of Standards Based Instructional Reviews and provide teachers with meaningful, specific feedback within 24 hours of observation.

Person Responsible William Brown (brownw2@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will conduct another round of Standards Based Instructional Reviews with a focus on teacher implementation of the feedback.

Person Responsible William Brown (brownw2@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will meet with PLCs to conduct an informal survey on the feedback provided and implementation.

Person Responsible William Brown (brownw2@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will continue Instructional Rounding and provide immediate feedback to ensure academic improvement.

Person Responsible	William Brown (brownw2@duvalschools.org)
---------------------------	--

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Results from the Standards Based Walk Through Dashboard for LaVilla for the 2019-2020 school year indicated that administrators rated Instructional Delivery 4.3 out of a possible 5 points. Specifically the area of weakness is the Student Task Alignment. This means that the tasks students are engaged in are not aligned with the standard. Results from the 5Essential Survey also supports this area of focus, since students indicated a decrease in academic demands by their teachers.

Measurable Outcome: Administrators plan to see the Student Task Alignment increase from red to blue by midyear (0.8 to 1.5). We also expect to see the 5Essentials survey increase in the category of Ambitious Instruction (Academic Press) by 5% points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Administrators will facilitate PLCs where teachers will bring student assignments and assessments and provide evidence as to why it is aligned to the standard or what can be added to ensure alignment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: As expressed by the Opportunity Myth, students should be given grade appropriate, standards-aligned tasks, assignments and assessments to ensure they are prepared for the state assessments and grade level promotion.

Action Steps to Implement

Review of first draft of School Improvement Plan to Standards Aligned Instruction with administrators.

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Facilitate professional development with teachers on the Standards Based Instructional Review process and expectations.

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Conduct first rounds of Standards Based Instructional Reviews.

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Engage with administrators to ensure alignment of School Improvement Plan to feedback from Instructional Reviews; Make revisions if necessary and narrow focus on next steps.

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Support PLC procedures with measurable improvement based on Instructional Rounding Action Plan/SIP

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

In November, participate in standards-based reviews with Region Leadership to review observational data and beginning of year diagnostics; revise or fine tune our action plan.

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Continue Instructional Rounding and provide feedback to ensure academic improvement on the mid-year assessments

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

na

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.

The LaVilla School of the Arts PBIS team will embrace the following key components:

- Establish a positive behavior support plan that is aligned with expected academic and behavioral outcomes
- Recognize students for exhibiting desired behaviors and for improvement of desired outcomes
- Establish classroom management plans that serve to address the needs of the whole child
- Establish a system where minimally intrusive events are managed at the classroom level through established classroom management plans and following specific schoolwide procedures

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: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00

Total:		\$0.00
--------	--	--------