Duval Virtual Instruction Academy

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
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: I (%) 2018-19: I (%) 2017-18: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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

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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	22%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	I		I	I

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Engaging students in a 21st century, virtual learning environment for a lifetime of success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Onward Online - Students succeeding in Their World."

School Leadership Team

Membership
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
Ertel, Mark	Principal	As the principal, he oversees the DVIA asynchronous Fulltime program, 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.
Macy, Matthew	Assistant Principal	As Assistant Principal, he supports the teachers and families in the Hospital Homebound program.
Ache, Laura	Assistant Principal	As Assistant Principal, she oversees the implementation of the Edgenuity curriculum (K-12) and supports teachers, students, and families virtually and in person at the Live Campus. This includes daily activities, professional development, evaluations, etc. She oversees and provides dedicated support for the middle school team. She also oversees K-12 testing at DVIA.
McSwain, Cyteria	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. This includes daily activities, professional development, evaluations, etc. She oversees and provides dedicated support for the high school team.
Poss, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	As Assistant Principal, she supports teachers, students, and families virtually and in-person at the Live Campus. 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/3/2015, Mark Ertel E

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,850

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

0

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

13

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	25	64	67	88	103	93	154	185	200	193	265	229	172	1838
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	6	0	8	6	6	10	20	20	48	34	6	167
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	1	8	6	9	24	28	32	74	39	21	248
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	29	21	37	58	56	56	79	37	28	409
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	59	40	59	77	72	66	86	89	47	602
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	79	37	28	200
HS GPA Below 2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	35	26	6	75

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	8	19	35	30	24	37	65	61	63	92	58	18	510

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		2	3	6	12	9	7	16	39	27	29	70	62	9	291
Students retained two or more times		0	0	2	3	6	4	11	26	21	27	26	24	5	155

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/26/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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		47%	55%					54%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								56%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								53%	54%
Math Achievement		40%	42%					57%	62%
Math Learning Gains								57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								52%	52%
Science Achievement		45%	54%					50%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		50%	59%					76%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	0%	51%	-51%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	73%	50%	23%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	59%	47%	12%	54%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
07	2022					
	2019	74%	44%	30%	52%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
08	2022					
	2019	100%	49%	51%	56%	44%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	64%	-64%	64%	-64%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	40%	57%	-17%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	65%	51%	14%	55%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
07	2022					
	2019	57%	47%	10%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	32%	-32%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	73%	49%	24%	53%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	58%	40%	18%	48%	10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	75%	67%	8%	67%	8%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	74%	69%	5%	71%	3%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	87%	68%	19%	70%	17%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	61%	57%	4%	61%	0%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	70%	61%	9%	57%	13%

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	24	37	36	20	29	34	20	41		91	20
ELL	33	45	30	28	42		20				
ASN	59	70		49	50		59				
BLK	32	41	37	15	27	35	22	37	26	97	30
HSP	51	45	29	33	36	40	33	65		100	35
MUL	39	47	35	25	31	39	32	38			
WHT	47	52	44	30	36	42	49	60	17	90	42
FRL	35	42	35	17	24	33	22	39	16	100	42

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		
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

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

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
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	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	78%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	57
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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	46
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

As with the previous school year, more students scored a level 1 on the FSA math and algebra/geometry EOCs than the number of students who scored a level 1 on the FSA ELA exam.

At the secondary level, students in all grade levels have failed more math courses than ELA courses. Overall, there were 33% more math course failures than ELA course failures among all grade bands.

At the elementary level there was not as much of a disparity between math and ELA course failures. Only a few more students in first and second grades failed ELA courses than math courses, more students in third grade failed math courses, and there was an equivalent amount of fourth and fifth graders who failed math and ELA courses. In third grade, one more student failed ELA than those who failed math courses and in fourth and fifth grades, more students failed math courses than ELA courses.

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

Elementary scores were negatively impacted by the synchronous Homeroom program that was implemented for the 2021-2022 school year with students reporting to DVIA. As the school has had turnover in student enrollment, the data for this current group differs from DVIA's final end of year data. For instance, all of DVIA's third graders in the asynchronous program passed last year, but the current group of third graders has the most retentions at the elementary level with 12 students. At the middle school level, seventh grade has the most retentions with 39, and at the high school level, tenth grade has the most retentions with 70.

In addition to significantly more math course failures and more students scoring a level 1 on the math FSA and EOCs across the board, recovery efforts for the entire school and the need to support students in high school with GPA concerns is a continued priority.

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

The unprecedented growth in enrollment during the last three school years created a need to grow the faculty from 20 to 50 to 70, which led to many first time teachers and teachers who were new to the virtual setting joining the team. Algebra 1 was taught by a teacher with experience in a middle school brick-and-mortar setting. Going forward, DVIA will be able to provide teachers with more experience in the field and the virtual setting in those math positions compared to last year. Two of the math teachers who were new to DVIA last year were surplused with the drop in student enrollment from last year, so students will be taught by math teachers with more experience this school year compared to last year. This will help with efforts to support students with recovery from learning loss during the pandemic. Additionally, this year the math department is structured with co-chairs to improve leadership and offer a stronger support system for the secondary math team.

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

The percentage of students at the high school level with GPA concerns under a 2.0 significantly decreased from 21.3% last year to 9.3% this year. Overall, 27.7% of the current group of students has fewer early warning indicators compared to 29.7% last year.

Additionally, at the elementary level, the percentage of fifth grade students who scored a level 1 on the FSA ELA assessment has decreased since last year.

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

Some of the contributing factors to this improvement is simply because DVIA's enrollment has decreased by 47.5% since last year and there has been turnover. Therefore, it is difficult to identify what steps DVIA took to ensure our current group of students is starting at a better place. However, DVIA implemented a tutoring program in the second half of the school year to help students via interventions and recovery in addition to test preparation. There was more success at the elementary level with student participation, which contributed to fewer students failing their courses and fewer scoring a level 1 on the FSAs.

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

DVIA will re-open the Live Campus to provide in-person support in addition to support in the Virtual Campus to students in K-12. Teachers will offer standards-driven, targeted remediation and enrichment opportunities in both settings. This will also enable more cross-curricular collaboration. Additionally, DVIA is implementing a new homeroom system at the secondary level this year so that all 6-12th grade students will have a dedicated mentor to provide success coaching and interventions.

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.

To further build a collaborative environment, DVIA will provide more professional development by external subject matter experts, such as FDLRS, to support collaborative instructional planning and improvements to organizational processes and procedures. This will support teachers and leaders to analyze their impact, particularly on subgroups of students, to enact change.

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

DVIA will re-evaluate the tutoring program it implemented in the second semester last year and work to strengthen the support systems to include more in-person opportunities through the Live Campus. Also, the leadership team and school counselors are working to develop a Parent Academy to improve the voice and contributions of our stakeholders, which is important to support students' credit recovery efforts and combat learning loss from the pandemic.

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Due to the increase of Students with Disabilities in DVIA's enrollment during the past couple of years, there is a need to improve the process and structure for providing interventions and improve SWD's proficiency levels on state assessments. SWD have the lowest ELA achievement levels (24%) and third lowest math achievement levels (20%) out of the subgroups. Black students had the lowest math achievement level of 15% followed by economically disadvantaged students with 17%. Focusing on support these subgroups coupled with a focus on math instruction will improve these outcomes for the 22-23 school year.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	DVIA will decrease the number of testing waivers for SWD by 2%, thereby increasing overall the school's overall proficiency rate. Black students and economically disadvantaged will increase math achievement levels by 15% each, which aligns with DVIA's goal for the area of focus related to math instruction.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The school leadership team, the ESE team, and department chairs will review data from PMAs and the new curriculum.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mark Ertel (ertelm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Changes to scheduling practices and instructional teams will provide more interventions for DVIA's SWD. SWD are enrolled in intensive reading courses in addition to those based on FSA ELA data. These courses are taught by former reading interventionists with ESE credentials. They will be supported by VE teachers during lesson planning and instruction. This enhanced collaboration and utilizing the district's Rewards curriculum will improve small-group differentiated instruction and better equip SWDs with strategies they may apply to all their classes. Changes to the scheduling practices for intensive math courses will also support reduction in achievement gaps for the other subgroups and improve math outcomes. DVIA students will have the same core math teacher for their intensive math course so teachers will be able to better differentiate instruction and provide more remediation and interventions to meet students' needs. This will also provide teachers with more data to enhance their progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-	Collaboration enhances relationship-building, progress monitoring efforts, and interventions to ensure students' academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs are

based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	met. These restructuring and additional intervention efforts will also lend to contributions from learning specialists and parental/guardian stakeholders to support an inclusive environment. https://www.ncld.org/reports-studies/forward-together-2021/collaboration/

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.

Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with 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)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	As the current group of DVIA students failed more math courses than ELA courses and 33% more scored a level 1 on the FSA math/EOCs than the FSA ELA assessment, there is a strong need to support math instruction and provide interventions.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	DVIA will improve students' math proficiency by 15% on the new F.A.S.T. assessment as compared to the proficiency rate on the FSA math assessment/EOCs.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The school leadership team and department chairs will review data from PMAs and the new curriculum to analyze during PLCs and grade level meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Restructuring Intensive Math Courses: With systematic implementation of interventions, students will have more opportunities for success by having the same experienced math teacher for both their core math course and intensive math course. This will enhance teachers' abilities to provide data-driven interventions and provide more data for progress monitoring. Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Based on data, provide interventions and remediation to smaller groups with Tier II support. 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 levels and provide differentiation. Progress Monitoring: Ensuring lessons/interventions are aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards, and assessments are completed with fidelity; evaluate the effectiveness with 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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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-progressmonitoringimproves-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/creatingan-action-plan/action-plan-teachingstrategies/

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.

Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with all 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   Kimberly Poss (filegerk@duvalschools.org)

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

Person Responsible   Kimberly Poss (filegerk@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)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

NA

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.

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 has career days in which students can learn from panels of guest speakers from various fields. Additionally, this school year DVIA is offering its first dual enrollment course, Student Life Skills, in-house so juniors and seniors have more support for earning accelerated credits and are better prepared post-graduation.

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 guest speakers 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.

Members of SAC and SDM meet monthly with the leadership team to evaluate and monitor systems that impact the school's culture and environment. 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 school culture and environment.

Leadership team: outlined in section I
SAC: Mark Ertel (Principal), Kristin Ramscar (School Counselor), Edith Kath (Education Support Employee), Donald Nelson (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.