

Duval County Public Schools

Duval Virtual Instruction Academy



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	28
Positive Culture & Environment	32
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
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: I (%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: I (%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	28
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	40%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		I	I	C

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ertel, Mark	Principal	As the principal, he oversees the DVIA asynchronous Full-time program, synchronous HomeRoom, Hospital Homebound, and the Part-time retake program. As the school's central instructional leader, he facilitates the SAC, guides the SDM process with close association of the bargaining unit representative, and sets the vision and mission extensions of the school's central statements.
Elkins, Dawn	Assistant Principal	As Assistant Principal of Curriculum, she oversees the implementation of the Edgenuity curriculum (K-12) and supports teachers, students, and families virtually and in-person at the Live Campus and testing site. This includes daily activities, professional development, evaluations, etc. She oversees and provides dedicated support for the secondary team.
Poss, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	As Assistant Principal, she supports teachers, students, and families virtually and in-person at the Live Campus and testing site. This includes daily activities, professional development, evaluations, etc. She oversees and supports the ESE team and provides dedicated support for the elementary team.
Maranto, Katie	Instructional Coach	As the first instructional coach at DVIA, she works with teachers to support student learning through data chats, planning/teaching differentiated standards-based live lessons, and progress monitoring efforts. She collaborates with administration and teachers to support the development and implementation of PD. She collaborates with teachers on various teams to seek out and implement technology and tools for best practices in the virtual environment.
Macy, Matthew	Assistant Principal	As Assistant Principal, he supports the teachers and families in the Hospital Homebound program.

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

78

Total number of students enrolled at the school

3,732

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

12

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

33

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	185	216	265	337	298	369	360	336	328	303	370	289	190	3846
Attendance below 90 percent	55	56	73	93	85	70	49	29	45	35	55	29	30	704
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	8	14	6	10	22	6	25	19	20	23	65	19	10	247
Course failure in Math	8	14	5	10	18	7	28	35	24	24	46	16	15	250
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	57	79	74	76	82	74	88	63	33	649
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	22	100	110	107	116	86	19	85	101	53	799
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
District Reading Test Indicator	0	16	76	137	68	161	151	102	109	87	114	70	31	1122
District Math Test Indicator	0	32	81	154	119	197	188	158	115	103	72	88	38	1345
HS GPA Below 2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	132	44	18	245

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	8	31	70	143	88	150	155	118	105	81	101	66	28	1144

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	16	17	8	28	27	6	36	34	30	54	100	37	5	398
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 8/30/2021

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	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

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	81	89	70	60	60	64	115	121	132	126	132	71	105	1226
Attendance below 90 percent	47	38	33	30	18	27	32	39	29	13	44	19	24	393
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	7	12	8	4	6	10	28	7	10	20	24	5	9	150
Course failure in Math	7	12	6	4	6	10	37	34	22	32	28	5	8	211
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	11	21	46	15	18	16	18	10	19	191
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	29	19	32	62	65	37	6	5	5	277

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	8	30	35	20	19	24	49	43	37	29	36	8	14	352

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		5	1	1	3	1	1	4	3	3	1	9	0	3	35
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					54%	61%	59%	51%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					56%	59%	44%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					53%	54%	21%	50%	52%
Math Achievement					57%	62%	50%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains					57%	59%	43%	55%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					52%	52%	50%	50%	52%
Science Achievement					50%	56%	57%	52%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					76%	78%		78%	77%

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
03	2021					
	2019	0%	51%	-51%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	50%	23%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	59%	47%	12%	54%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
07	2021					
	2019	74%	44%	30%	52%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
08	2021					
	2019	100%	49%	51%	56%	44%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
09	2021					
	2019	63%	48%	15%	55%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-100%				
10	2021					
	2019	56%	48%	8%	53%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	0%	64%	-64%	64%	-64%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	57%	-17%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	65%	51%	14%	55%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
07	2021					
	2019	57%	47%	10%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	32%	-32%	46%	-46%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	73%	49%	24%	53%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	58%	40%	18%	48%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	75%	67%	8%	67%	8%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	74%	69%	5%	71%	3%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	87%	68%	19%	70%	17%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	61%	57%	4%	61%	0%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	70%	61%	9%	57%	13%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Students in grades 3-12 completed two district Progress Monitoring Assessments via Performance Matters for courses with an FSA or state EOC as follows.

FSA ELA: grades 3-10

FSA Math: grades 3-8

Algebra 1 EOC: students enrolled in the course in grades 8-12

Geometry EOC: students enrolled in the course in grades 8-12

NGSS Science: grades 5 and 8

NGSS Biology: grades 8-12

NGSS Civics: grades 6-8

NGSS U.S. History: grades 9-12

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0/0%	42/62%	43/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	7/70%	3/60%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	7/64%	4/50%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/50%	1/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0%	40/62%	31/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	5/50%	2/40%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	8/73%	4/57%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	2/100%	1/50%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0/0%	48/80%	35/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	6/50%	6/55%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	4/67%	3/60%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/100%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0%	46/75%	39/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	9/69%	7/58%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	4/67%	3/60%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/100%	1/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0/0%	41/58%	31/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	5/38%	4/57%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	4/80%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	3/100%	1/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0%	35/49%	30/54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	4/31%	2/29%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	3/60%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/33%	2/67%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0/0%	33/53%	24/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	4/40%	3/43%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/50%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0/0%	55/65%	39/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	5/71%	2/25%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	6/60%	5/36%
	English Language Learners	0/0%		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0%	54/70%	48/62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	3/60%	1/17%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	6/67%	5/36%
	English Language Learners	0/0%		

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0/0%	55/53%	35/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	12/60%	2/15%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	9/56%	5/42%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0%	64/65% [Alg: 4/57%]	39/49% [Alg: 3/60%]
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	9/60% [Alg: 0/0%]	5/45% [Alg: 0/0%]
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	7/50% [Alg: 1/100%]	3/38% [Alg: 0/0%]
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0% [Alg: 0/0%]	0/0% [Alg: 0/0%]
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	0/0%	[6th: 2/100%] [7th: 34/45%] [8th: 11/24%]	[6th: 1/50%] [7th: 17/33%] [8th: 8/23%]
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	[6th: 0/0%] [7th: 5/36%] [8th: 1/14%]	[6th: 0/0%] [7th: 4/67%] [8th: 0/0%]
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	[6th: 0/0%] [7th: 4/27%] [8th: 2/50%]	[6th: 0/0%] [7th: 0/0%] [8th: 2/67%]
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0/0%	83/58%	51/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	13/46%	4/31%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	6/67%	6/67%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0%	64/47% [Alg: 17/44%] [Geo: 10/77%]	63/49% [Alg: 19/58%] [Geo: 10/71%]
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	9/35% [Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]	7/50% [Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	2/25% [Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 1/100%]	6/55% [Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 2/100%]
	English Language Learners	0/0%	2/67% [Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]	1/50% [Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0/0%	58/42% [Bio: 13/45%]	60/47% [Bio: 16/70%]
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	8/31%	7/44%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	5/50%	4/44%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/33%	1/33%

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0/0%	57/48%	43/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	9/35%	4/25%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	3/38%	1/25%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0%	[Alg: 8/42%] [Geo: 9/29%]	[Alg: 7/41%] [Geo: 11/34%]
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]
	English Language Learners	0/0%	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 1/100%]	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 1/100%]
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0/0%	11/37%	14/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	2/25%	2/33%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0/0%	63/45%	50/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	6/25%	4/29%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	4/31%	3/23%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	2/67%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0%	[Alg: 12/22%] [Geo: 1/3%]	[Alg: 12/29%] [Geo: 6/21%]
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	[Alg: 3/33%] [Geo: 0/0%]	[Alg: 3/38%] [Geo: 0/0%]
	English Language Learners	0/0%	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0/0%	22/29%	10/17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	5/28%	2/25%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	2/22%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/50%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0/0%	15/24%	7/25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	4/22%	1/17%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	2/40%	1/33%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0%	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 2/9%]	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 1/7%]
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: %]	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]
	English Language Learners	0/0%	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 0/0%]
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0/0%	2/13%	2/18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	2/29%	2/50%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0/0%	12/26%	3/27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	2/22%	0/0%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	2/33%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/0%	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 2/40%]	[Alg: 0/0%] [Geo: 3/33%]
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	[Alg 1: 0/0%]	[Geo: 0/0%] [Alg 1: 0/0%]
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	[Alg 1: 0/0%]	[Geo: 0/0%] [Alg 1: 0/0%]
	English Language Learners	0/0%	[Alg 1: 0/0%]	[Geo: 0/0%] [Alg 1: 0/0%]
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0/0%	4/80%	0/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

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	36	46	33	21	15	11	29	60			
ELL	22	36		13	18		20				
ASN	58	38		46	21		54				
BLK	39	38	31	18	13	8	33	28	21		

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
HSP	48	47	33	37	22	45	52	46			
MUL	54	41		26	5		60				
WHT	65	54	37	47	28	16	59	63	53	81	28
FRL	47	32		27	13	8	43	36		80	8
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	

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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	70%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	22
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	43
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	25
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
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	37
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	48
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	33
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Enrollments among K-12 from 20-21 to 21-22 years have an overall similar average of students with multiple early warning signs with the largest group in grades 6-8 (36.91% in 21-22 and 35.05% in 20-21).

Although the overall ELA course failure rate significantly decreased among K-12 from 12% (20-21) to 6.42% (21-22) and the math course failure rate significantly decreased from 17% (20-21) to 6.5% (21-22), the retention rate significantly increased from 2.85% (20-21) to 10.35% (21-22). The implications of this are evident in the increase of GPAs below a 2.0 among high school students; there was an 11.8% increase in students with a GPA below 2.0 in grades 9-12 (9.4% in 20-21 and 21.2% in 21-22).

16.83% of students in grade 9 and 35.68% of students in grade 10 are beginning the 21-22 school year with a GPA below 2.0 versus 0.07% (+16.76% in 9th) and 10.24% (+25.44% in 10th) at the beginning of the 20-21 school year. There was an increase of 9.62% among grade 11 and an increase of 5.67% among grade 12 for GPAs below 2.0.

Both 2021 and 2019 state assessments reveal a higher percentage of students who scored a level 1 in math compared to ELA (+5% in 20-21 and +8.72% in 19-20). More students in K-12 failed math courses than ELA courses in both 19-20 and 20-21 with the exception of high school ELA course failure in 20-21 (1.38% greater than math failures).

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

Besides a higher percentage of level 1 students on FSA math than FSA ELA and the trend of more math course failures overall, the 20-21 5E Survey revealed students rated the level of DVIA's math instruction as a 33 compared to the level of ELA instruction as a 44. The level of Ambitious Instruction reported by the 5E Survey decreased by 11 points from the 19-20 to the 20-21 school year. Therefore, there is a greater need for improvement in math instruction to support students' learning. Additionally, there is a greater need for support in grades 9-10 than grades 11-12 to offset the impacts of higher retention rates and lower GPAs.

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

Notably, DVIA's enrollment from the 20-21 to 21-22 school year increased by 214% following an equally substantial increase from the 19-20 to 20-21 school year. Therefore, the trends are not necessarily a direct result of DVIA's instructional impact during the 20-21 school year. However, to

meet the needs of all students, especially the significant increase in ESE students, we will need support from additional faculty and administration. We will need to differentiate our PD to support the faculty as a whole to help those who are less technologically skilled and new to their grade levels. We will develop PD specific to identifying students' needs, planning, and delivery of small group instruction as many teachers have no or limited experience of the process within an asynchronous program regardless of their technical skills and familiarity with the platforms.

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

There was a significant decrease in the overall failure rate of ELA and math courses of -5.58% and -10.5% respectively between the 19-20 and 20-21 school years. Individual elementary, middle, and high school ELA and math course failure rates all adhere to this trend. Additionally, there was a 3% decrease of students earning a level 1 on the FSA math assessments with 13% fewer in middle school and 12.22% in elementary.

There was a 3% increase in proficiency from the winter PMA to the spring PMA in high school math courses. 8th graders in accelerated courses had significantly large gains in proficiency between these two administrations: 14% for Alg 1 students and 25% for biology students.

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

We offered PD sessions and time for collaborative planning by PLCs about methods to help students be successful in a virtual setting by differentiating and providing success coaching sessions and tools to students and their families as part of our AAIT process. These helped to reduce the amount of ELA and math course failures. We will continue to provide this PD and build on these efforts to differentiate more during small group instruction.

The instructor for the accelerated 8th graders in biology began co-teaching some lessons, especially during test preparation, with the high school biology teacher and students. This further engaged the students which resulted in high attendance rates for those lessons.

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

Frequently surveying the instructional faculty outside of the 5 Essentials Survey will allow for PD opportunities to be adjusted throughout the year to meet teachers' needs, which will, in turn, accelerate student learning. This will include designated time for standards-based data analysis and regularly scheduled common planning opportunities. Implementing peer-to-peer observation cycles will help determine the effectiveness of future PD that will be aimed at helping students overcome gaps in all subject areas as evidence by the increased retention rates in elementary and secondary coupled with the lower GPAs at the high school level.

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.

This year DVIA is strengthening its mentor/mentee program. With the addition of more than double last year's instructional positions, our mentor program is based on supporting teachers who are new to the virtual environment while allowing new-to-DVIA teachers to make observations and provide feedback to improve the instruction of returning faculty members. We will facilitate regular peer-to-peer lesson observation cycles with specific standards-based goals and implementation of instructional best practices relating to small group instruction within an asynchronous program. PD in preparation for these will include methods to improve student discussion quality during lessons, which is needed per the 5E Survey, in addition to an emphasis on specific strategies for math instruction in the virtual environment, which is needed per the course failure rate and higher amount of level 1

students. Ultimately, this should also develop stronger teacher-leaders on our faculty and further encourage collaboration.

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

DVIA has added additional VE, ESOL, and standards coaching positions to the faculty. These new positions will provide support for teachers during the planning and facilitation of small-group standards-based instruction to an extent that has not been previously feasible. The PD offered this year will be tailored to helping instructors adjust to meet students' targeted needs and effectively incorporate the additional supports afforded by the new positions. The VE, ESOL, and standards coaches will contribute to facilitating the PD and participating in the instruction of small groups across grade levels and content areas to assist teachers meeting students' needs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students enrolled in 21-22 have failed more math courses than ELA courses. Students who scored a level 1 on state math assessments in 20-21 are as follows: 23.10% of elementary, 30.18% of middle school, and 22.4% of high school.

Measurable Outcome: Improve learning gains so that less than 20% of students at the elementary, middle, and high school levels score a level 1 on their math assessment for the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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 Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Data from student and teacher responses on the 2021 5 E Survey reveals a need for more student-driven opportunities to engage with the content and each other. The Ambitious Instruction category dropped to 50 points with a -30 point change in the subcategory of student discussion quality as rated by teachers and students. 42% of students reported never discussing possible solutions with other students and 62% reported never writing a math problem for others to solve. 24% of students reported never or 1-2 times/semester debating the meaning of a reading and 35% reported never improving a piece of writing as a class or with partners. To offset the effects of our asynchronous program, teachers will provide more small group instruction to improve student discussion quality and increase the academic press through differentiation. DVIA will facilitate PD to help improve teachers' instructional practices related to small-group instruction and follow up with monthly observation and feedback cycles via the mentorship program. While our instructors and school rate highly for providing a supportive environment, increasing ambitious instruction should have a direct effect on student learning.

Measurable Outcome:

The Ambitious Instruction category of the 2022 5 E Survey will improve by a minimum of 20 points so that DVIA's instruction is rated as "strong" or "very strong" as in previous school years. ESSA sub groups of Economically Disadvantaged students is currently 34% and Students with Disabilities is currently 32%. The goal for both sub groups is to reach at least 41%

Monitoring:

The standards coaches will collaborate with the testing coordinator and VE team to facilitate data analysis with teachers in PLCs after each PMA administration. As part of the peer-to-peer observation cycles, teachers will provide feedback to each other as adjustments are made to instruction to differentiate with small group lessons based on the data analysis and practices/strategies related to student discussion during lessons.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie Maranto (marantok1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Lesson studies will be implemented through peer-to-peer observation cycles in all content areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

This strategy is effectively used by our CETs and will be a strong foundation for supporting both new and returning DVIA teachers in a collaborative setting. We will use the FEAPs to set goals related to the PD to improve standards-based instruction in small groups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. survey teachers to determine PD needs
2. develop and facilitate PD schedule based on teachers' needs and strategies to improve student participation, discussion, and engagement in live lessons
3. schedule peer-to-peer lesson observation cycles
4. teachers share findings from lesson studies in PLCs
5. repeat steps 3-4 on a regular basis to improve small group instruction and meet students' needs

Person Responsible

Dawn Elkins (elkinsd@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Based on 2020-21 data, ELA was identified as a critical need. Students at our school need support with learning the foundational skills of how to read and also understanding the content they are reading. As an Area of Focus, student success in ELA progress will also increase student achievement in other subject areas.

o The percentage of students in grades 3-5, below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment are as follows: 3rd grade is 44%, 4th grade is 53%, and 5th grade is 45%.

o The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2020-2021 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment is as follows: 1st - 80% and 2nd - 73%

Measurable Outcome:

K-5 data:

*Increase percentage of K-2 students scoring "At Grade Level" or above by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.

*Increase percentage of 3 -5 grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.

Monitoring:

Our school leadership team, district content specialist support, and Supplemental Instructional APs will review ELA data from district assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Data Driven Lesson Planning: Understanding where students are with mastery of standards, using data from informal and formal assessments, planning clear objectives, implementation, and checking for understanding when lesson planning.

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Not all students are on the same level, but all standards must be mastered. Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet students at their level to support their needs.

Progress Monitoring: Ensuring whole group lessons, interventions, and assessments are done with fidelity. Checking effectiveness from student data.

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: Collecting data from classrooms in real time and providing immediate and clear feedback for teachers and school leadership teams to work together to ensure effectiveness.

Data-driven Lesson Planning: Effective lesson planning requires teachers to determine three essential components such as the objective, the implementation, and a reflection. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/howto-plan-effective-lessons>

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Small group instruction is the key to data-driven results and is the gateway to meeting the needs of all learners. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/turn-small-reading-groups-intobig-wins>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Progress Monitoring: Student progress monitoring helps teachers evaluate how effective their instruction is, either for individual students or for the entire class. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/how-student-progressmonitoring-improves-instruction>

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: The implementation review is a plan designed to 1) recognize accomplishments, 2) track actions, 3) measure implementation impact, 4) evaluate the plan, 5) determine next steps. It may be used by the school alone or with the assistance of the support lead. <https://institutionalresearch.syr.edu/what-we-do/student-ratings/creating-an-action-plan/action-plan-teachingstrategies/>

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with all four strategies listed above. Professional Development during Early Release Days and Common Planning will be essential for Leadership to support teachers. Based on observational data and teacher feedback, PD topics will be set before each Early Release and Common Planning.

Person Responsible Mark Ertel (ertelm@duvalschools.org)

During Common Planning and individual teacher data chats, specific data pertaining to ELA reading and student success will be discussed and analyzed to ensure we are monitoring progress.

Person Responsible Mark Ertel (ertelm@duvalschools.org)

Give immediate feedback on any observations/walkthroughs conducted by state support, school leadership, district content specialists, and district leadership.

Person Responsible Mark Ertel (ertelm@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

N/A

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.

The school leadership team and school counselors work closely with SAC and SDM to review and monitor efforts to meet the goals and objectives of the SIP. This includes reviewing results from the 5 Essentials survey to set goals and identify areas to improve equity and performance. With the increase of the student body, the leadership team intends to grow SAC membership to encourage more involvement among stakeholder groups. This year DVIA is also planning a virtual career showcase to incorporate more local stakeholders to enhance students' college and career readiness goals and cultivate positive relationships with students and faculty.

School counselors facilitate college awareness seminars, testing support, financial aid nights, and other programs to support students planning to take the step to college. They also provide guidance related to workforce options and job skill referrals.

DVIA offers a Virtual Campus (VC), via a Teams meeting, staffed by teachers on a rotational basis so students have access to supports in a positive and safe environment while working remotely. The VC affords opportunities for students to receive content-related assistance in a one-on-one or small group setting and access to tools and success coaching to help them be successful in the virtual setting. For the first month of the school year, DVIA teachers hosted daily Virtual Orientation Success Sessions to establish high expectations in a caring environment for students as they adjusted to asynchronous learning. Teachers use Microsoft Teams for live lessons, small group instruction, and one-on-one tutoring while also providing opportunities for students to respectfully and safely interact and engage with each other. Teachers have also utilized Skype for virtual field trips so students make connections and learn from non-local stakeholders while gaining exposure to various locations, museums, etc. that they may otherwise not experience.

Local businesses have partnered with DVIA to provide incentives, such as gift cards and tickets to local sporting events, for students to participate in teacher-led boot camps to prepare for state assessments and/or to become college/grad ready. Teachers host these boot camp lessons virtually in their Teams classrooms and in person at the Live Campus (LC) where students benefit from in-person interactions with

faculty and other students. Students may also make appointments to work with teachers at the LC based on their needs.

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

Leadership team: outlined in section I

SAC: Mark Ertel (Principal), Kristin Ramscar (School Counselor), Edith Kath (Education Support Employee), Larry Zenke (Business/Community), and other parent participants TBD this year as previous members were parents of DVIA graduates

SDM: representatives per the by-laws elected by the faculty and staff

Some of the local businesses that have supported boot camp incentives in the past include Chik-fil-A, Yobe, and the Jacksonville Jaguars.