Lavilla School Of The Arts

2021-22 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: 7/28/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	28%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Knight, Lianna	Principal	Instructional Leader
Brown, William	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader
Sznakowski, Anthony	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader
Jackson, Morgan	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair
Martin, Donnie	Teacher, K-12	Testing Coordinator
Kennedy, Sarah	Teacher, ESE	Fully Released ESE Teacher
Montoya, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Gifted Lead
Ottley, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Dance Director
Withers, Kori	Teacher, K-12	Professional Development Facilitator

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/28/2021, 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.*

2

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

978

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	375	306	292	0	0	0	0	973
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	56	46	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	15	21	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	29	28	0	0	0	0	82
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	18	21	14	0	0	0	0	53

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 9/15/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				75%	43%	54%	73%	42%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	49%	54%	58%	47%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	45%	47%	50%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				72%	49%	58%	74%	46%	58%
Math Learning Gains				59%	50%	57%	59%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	47%	51%	48%	47%	51%
Science Achievement				70%	44%	51%	73%	45%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				88%	68%	72%	98%	82%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	71%	47%	24%	54%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	78%	44%	34%	52%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
08	2021					
	2019	77%	49%	28%	56%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	55%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	77%	47%	30%	54%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2021					
	2019	19%	32%	-13%	46%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	70%	40%	30%	48%	22%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	67%	-67%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	88%	69%	19%	71%	17%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	89%	57%	32%	61%	28%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Students are monitored by use of formative and informative assessments. Parents, teachers, and students are invovled in the student progress.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	35	37	26	29	29	23	26	58			
ELL	44	53	58	47	33						
ASN	71	40		81	35			82	90		
BLK	50	42	31	43	29	27	35	66	73		
HSP	69	56	50	57	47	46	74	85	76		
MUL	70	51		73	48	30	75	80	85		
WHT	78	57	39	75	47	43	79	84	89		
FRL	51	44	37	47	31	26	52	58	77		
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						

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
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	511
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	47

English Language Learners	
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	67
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	44
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	62
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	64
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	66
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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Every area showed a decrease with the exception of Reading Gains and Lowest Performing Quartile Gains

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math Proficiency and Lowest Performing Quartile in Math

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Our math scores have continuously been the area in need of improvement. This school year we have hired a Math Interventionist who is assigned to work with our Lowest Performing Quartile students and pushes into those classrooms to help conduct teacher led small groups specifically addressing those weakest math standards.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Reading Gains

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We had a schoolwide focus on reading across curriculums.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Standards aligned instruction with a focus on providing students with assessments that are on grade level and standards aligned.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Standards alignment
Small group Instruction
Data Analysis

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Collaborative Planning
Peer Observations and Reflections
Schoolwide Vision/Mission/Rebranding

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In schools with strong Collaborative Teachers, all teachers collaborate to promote professional growth. In such schools, teachers are: active partners in school improvement, committed to the school, and focused on professional development.This goal was derived from the 5Essential Survey and had the the biggest drop from the previous school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Administrators plan to see the 5Essential Measure, Collaborative Practices, move from weak neutral to strong. We also expect to see teachers observe each others' practice, and work together to review assessment data and develop instructional strategies.
Monitoring:	Teachers will complete two observations per quarter and complete a reflection form submitted to the administrative team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The administrative team will provide time for teachers to observe one another during the school day to gain ideas and stratgies that can be implemented into their classroom as well as to receive feedback and suggestions from their colleagues.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As expressed in the 5Essentials survey, our teachers expressed that they did not have the time needed to observe their co-workers and collaborate effectively.

Action Steps to Implement

Administrators will share the results of the 5Essentials suvery in Departmental Meetings, specifically in the area of Collaborative Teachers.

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

The administrative team will require teachers to observe at least two colleagues each quarter:
Quarter 1: Art teachers will observe Academic and Academic teachers will observe Art.
Quarter 2: Teachers will observe two teachers outside of their content area.
Quarter 3: Teachers will observe two teachers in their same content area.

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Each quarter teachers will be requried to complete a reflection form indicating the following:
1. Instructional Strategy Observed
2. Something new they learned
3. Something they plan to implement into their classroom as a result of the observation

Person Responsible Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will meet with PLCs to conduct an informal survey on the effectiveness of the observations on teacher practices.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. 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 2020-2021 school year indicated that administrators rated Assessing Student Learning 3.8 out of a possible 5 points. Specifically the area of weakness is the FSA Alignment. This means that the student assessment experience was not always equivalent to state standards. This may include, but is not limited to, item specifications, appropriate item types, assessment limits, etc.
Measurable Outcome:	Administrators plan to see the FSA Alignment increase from 74% to 80% by midyear.
Monitoring:	Administrators will conduct weekly standards aligned walk throughs and review the dashboard for improvement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Administrators will facilitaite PLCs where teachers will bring student assessments and provide evidence as to why it is a grade level equivalent experience and includes questions at a Level 3/proficiency or higher.
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 Opportunity Myth and the importance of providing grade level (or higher) assessment opportunities for students.

Person Responsible	Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Conduct first rounds of Standards Based Walkthroughs and callibrate with administrators.

Person Responsible	Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Analyze Standards Walkthrough results, make revisions if necessary and narrow focus for future walkthroughs.

Person Responsible	Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

LaVilla's School Safety Dashboard reflects that we are lower than the county and state in all categories. We will continue to work Violent Incidents, specifically in the area of bullying.

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.

Our PBIS teams meets on a monthly basis to promote positive school culture and environment. There focus is to provide positive recognitions through Cupcake Club, Random Acts of Candy, clear rituals and routines (which helps to support and reduce unwanted behaviors). We have a reward/recognition program in place to recognize students and faculty committed to character/mindfulness traits.

Cupcake Crew that recognizes students with improved behavior/academics in quarterly intervals.
Monthly character/mindfulness trait recognize faculty members who best exhibit each month's trait with small gift bag.
Random act of candy biweekly that recognizes students exhibiting targeted behaviors.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Anthony Sznakowski Admin/Data Specialist Assistant Principal
Sarah Hearn Team Leader/Facilitator/Point of Contact Teacher
Christianne Blumberg Classroom Teacher Liaison Teacher
Kelly Spencer Recorder Guidance Counselor
Nieda Thomas Family/Student Liaison * ISSP

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00