Lavilla School Of The Arts

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lavilla School Of The Arts

501 N DAVIS ST, Jacksonville, FL 32202

http://www.duvalschools.org/lavilla

Demographics

Principal: Lianna Knight M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (68%) 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: 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	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

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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	50%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Knight, Lianna	Principal	Instructional Leader
Joseph, Johnson	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader
Happel, Seth	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader
Jackson, Morgan	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair
Martin, Donnie	Teacher, K-12	Testing Coordinator
Blumberg, Christianne	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
Wrenn, Mary	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/1/2014, Lianna Knight M

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
56

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,020

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	364	341	294	0	0	0	0	999
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	32	52	0	0	0	0	160
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	21	18	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	1	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	28	16	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	32	27	0	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	48	23	0	0	0	0	136
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	36	39	26	0	0	0	0	101

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/27/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	72%	43%	50%				75%	43%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						63%	49%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						53%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	70%	35%	36%				72%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains	66%						59%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						41%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	70%	48%	53%				70%	44%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	53%	58%				88%	68%	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	2022					
	2019	71%	47%	24%	54%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	78%	44%	34%	52%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
08	2022					
	2019	77%	49%	28%	56%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	55%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	77%	47%	30%	54%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2022					
	2019	19%	32%	-13%	46%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	70%	40%	30%	48%	22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	67%	-67%	67%	-67%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	88%	69%	19%	71%	17%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	89%	57%	32%	61%	28%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	42	42	33	38	56	54	37	60	85		
ELL	53	47		65	61						
ASN	75	45		85	60		82				
BLK	53	51	33	54	61	55	49	74	94		
HSP	73	62	65	67	65	50	72	87	74		
MUL	76	60	57	73	70	67	82	95	94		
WHT	84	65	58	81	69	63	82	93	89		
FRL	58	52	40	55	61	54	52	78	79		
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						

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
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						
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	615
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
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	57
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	69
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	58
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	68
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	75
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	76
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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

All areas showed an increase in proficiency and gains from the previous school year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Although our Lowest Performing Quartile students in Reading gained from the previous year, we would still like to increase that area to 50%.

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

Fidelity in implementation of the new Reading Program, encourage and provide class time for independent reading, and a school-wide initiative focused on embedding reading in all content areas.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

We showed the highest improvement in our Math Learning GAins.

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

We hired a math interventionist to conduct pushins and pull outs, our math department embedded small group instruction, and we held after school tutoring sessions.

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

Continued small group instruction and implementing our tutoring program sooner in the school year.

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.

Continued professional development on small group instruction, data analysis to determine student groups, and continued support of the new BEST standards and digital platforms.

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

Teachers will observe one their colleagues, we will spotlight best practices, and work collaboratively across curriculums.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	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.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	This goal was derived from the 5Essential Survey and although improved from last school year, we want to continue to ensure it stays in the Very Strong category. During this process we expect to continue to see teachers observe each others' practice, and work together to review assessment data and develop instructional strategies.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	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: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The administrative team will provide time for teachers to observe one another during the school day to gain ideas and strategies that can be implemented into their classroom as well as to receive feedback and suggestions from their colleagues.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Administrators will share the results of the 5Essentials survey 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   Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

To also improve Collaborative Practices, we will focus on strong Teacher-Teacher Trust. Based on a comparison to the benchmark, LaVilla School of the Arts is neutral on this measure.

Person Responsible   Seth Happel (happels1@duvalschools.org)

We plan to help colleagues create meaningful and long-lasting relationships through after school activities: family fun night, once a month get togethers outside of school, and

Person Responsible   Seth Happel (happels1@duvalschools.org)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Supportive Environment	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	In schools with a Supportive Environment, the school is safe, demanding, and supportive. In such schools: 1. students feel safe in and around the school, 2. they find teachers trust-worthy and responsive to their academic needs, 3. all students value hard work, and 4. teachers push all students toward high academic performance.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Based off of the 5Essentials Survey, the category of Supportive Environment is our lowest and considered Very Weak. Our goal is to increase this category to Neutral.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will provide a midyear survey to our students to gauge how they feel about their safety at our school.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Johnson Joseph (josephj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	As evidenced by the 5 Essentials survey, 39% of our students felt unsafe or somewhat safe in our restrooms, 23% feel unsafe or somewhat safe in our hallways, and 41% feel unsafe or somewhat safe outside around the school.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students will attend two grade level assemblies this school year (Fall and Spring) with safety as one of the topics. During this assembly will teach the students our CHAMPS expectations for the hallways, restrooms, and Dining Hall.

Person Responsible	Johnson Joseph (josephj@duvalschools.org)

Our security guard and School Resource Officer will make more frequent walk throughs of the student restrooms, hallways, and outside areas around the school. They will be required to keep a checklist of the areas they visited, when they were visited, and what they saw.

Person Responsible	Johnson Joseph (josephj@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Results from the Standards Based Walk Through Dashboard for LaVilla for the 2020-2021 school year indicated that administrators rated Assessing Student Learning 3.6 out of a possible 5 points. Specifically the area of weakness is Determining Mastery of the Standard. This means that students are completing activities/tasks with at least a level 3 proficiency rating that aligns with the standards.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Administrators plan to see the FSA Alignment increase from 66% to 72% by midyear.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Administrators will conduct weekly standards aligned walk throughs and review the dashboard for improvement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Administrators will facilitate Collaborative Learning sessions 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: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Administrators will attend Collaborative Learning sessions with the teachers to review data and create plans to increase student achievement.

Person Responsible	Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will facilitate Collaborative Planning sessions with the teachers to create assignments, tasks, and assessments geared toward the goal of increasing student achievement.

Person Responsible	Lianna Knight (knightl2@duvalschools.org)

Conduct first rounds of Standards Based Walkthroughs and calibrate 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)

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 school culture and environment.

Christianne Blumberg, Fully Released VE Teacher and PBIS Lead
Eric Lampkin, Dean and PBIS member
Johnson Joseph, Assistant Principal for PBIS
Rebecca Tibble, VE teacher and PBIS member
Kevin McLain, PE teacher and PBIS member