

Duval County Public Schools

Duval Virtual Instruction Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Duval Virtual Instruction Academy

7000 POWERS AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32217

<http://www.duvalschools.org/dvia>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ertel, Mark	Principal	Overall operations of the school.
McSwain, Cyteria	Assistant Principal	Primary role is master scheduling and curriculum and instruction. All other duties as assigned to operate the school and support students.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

We have a LEAD team of faculty that reviews all data and collaborates on setting goals. The SAC participates in the review and revision prior to finalizing the SIP.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Monthly reports to the SAC. Regular review of the data by the LEAD team. Bi-weekly grade level collaboration on reaching the bottom quartile readers to use subject areas to support reading skills

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	22%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: I 2019-20: I 2018-19: I 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	21	15	27	26	35	43	40	40	247
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	5	4	19
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	2	12	8	10	29	27	37	125
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	14	9	9	29	21	32	116
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	25	26	23	31	48	158
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	27	50	42	28	57	209
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	10	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	33

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	10	5	22	34	44	50	49	68	282

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	7	2	14	9	10	29	27	28	126
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	7	3	3	18	19	23	75

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	3	6	0	8	6	6	10	20	167
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	1	8	6	9	24	28	248
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	29	21	37	58	56	409
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	59	40	59	77	72	602
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
HS GPA Below 2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	8	19	35	30	24	37	65	61	510

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	6	12	9	7	16	39	27	291
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	3	6	4	11	26	21	155

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	6	0	8	6	6	10	20	59
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	1	8	6	9	24	28	82
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	29	21	37	58	56	209
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	59	40	59	77	72	314
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
HS GPA Below 2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	8	19	35	30	24	37	65	61	279

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	6	12	9	7	16	39	27	121
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	3	6	4	11	26	21	73

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	33	45	53	33	47	55	53		
ELA Learning Gains				46			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			34		
Math Achievement*	15	46	55	18	40	42	33		
Math Learning Gains				31			20		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			14		
Science Achievement*	33	45	52	23	45	54	48		
Social Studies Achievement*	43	62	68	38	50	59	43		
Middle School Acceleration	53	73	70	27	45	51	44		
Graduation Rate	70	72	74	94	41	50	82		
College and Career Acceleration	27	54	53	40	65	70	27		
ELP Progress		47	55		68	70			

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	294
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	82
Graduation Rate	70

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	78

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Graduation Rate	94

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	3	1
ELL	36	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	43			
BLK	33	Yes	2	
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	31	Yes	3	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	2	
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	57			
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	47			
MUL	36	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	46			
FRL	37	Yes	2	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	33			15			33	43	53	70	27	
SWD	20			11			23	30		8	6	
ELL	21			18							3	
AMI												
ASN	58			28							2	
BLK	35			13			21	33	55	20	8	
HSP	38			22			39	44		18	6	
MUL	39			26			46	40			5	
PAC												
WHT	39			22			43	55	48	36	8	
FRL	31			12			21	28		20	7	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	33	46	38	18	31	37	23	38	27	94	40	
SWD	24	37	36	20	29	34	20	41		91	20	
ELL	33	45	30	28	42		20					
AMI												
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				
PAC												
WHT	47	52	44	30	36	42	49	60	17	90	42	
FRL	35	42	35	17	24	33	22	39	16	100	42	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	53	46	34	33	20	14	48	43	44	82	27	
SWD	36	46	33	21	15	11	29	60				
ELL	22	36		13	18		20					
AMI												
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					
PAC												
WHT	65	54	37	47	28	16	59	63	53	81	28	
FRL	47	32		27	13	8	43	36		80	8	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	43%	44%	-1%	50%	-7%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	47%	-2%	54%	-9%
07	2023 - Spring	43%	40%	3%	47%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	36%	41%	-5%	47%	-11%
09	2023 - Spring	36%	42%	-6%	48%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	50%	-17%	58%	-25%
06	2023 - Spring	42%	38%	4%	47%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	22%	46%	-24%	50%	-28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	26%	43%	-17%	54%	-28%
07	2023 - Spring	21%	40%	-19%	48%	-27%
03	2023 - Spring	17%	59%	-42%	59%	-42%
04	2023 - Spring	7%	58%	-51%	61%	-54%
08	2023 - Spring	27%	45%	-18%	55%	-28%
05	2023 - Spring	19%	52%	-33%	55%	-36%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	16%	35%	-19%	44%	-28%
05	2023 - Spring	24%	48%	-24%	51%	-27%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	17%	52%	-35%	50%	-33%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	20%	52%	-32%	48%	-28%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	52%	64%	-12%	63%	-11%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	43%	63%	-20%	66%	-23%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	42%	60%	-18%	63%	-21%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Third and eighth grade reading. The third grade saw an increase in last minute enrollments. Upon review many of the students were level 1 and low level 2 upon enrollment in DVIA. The eighth grade also saw a large number of students enroll late, up to 2 weeks into the school year. Many of the students were ESE students needing services that an online school cannot directly provide. IEP's needed to be amended at a very high rate. Absenteeism was a significant issue for the 8th grade. When parent/teacher conferences were facilitated it was discerned that the vast majority of students had little to no adult supervision during the day.

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

Overall ELA proficiency had a significant decline across all students in the school. The enrollment increase due to Covid brought many ESE and lower level readers to DVIA. With a district policy of accepting all applications regardless of level and service needs (most online schools in Florida have learning level minimums to enroll), DVIA struggled to support the sheer number of new students who came in as low level readers.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Algebra and Geometry had the largest gaps of school to state in proficiency. This is a trend noted from the beginning of the large increase in enrollments during the pandemic. The number of low level performing students enrolling over these past three years has stressed the instructional staff as they tried to reach these students for individualized instructional support.

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

Fifth and seventh grade ELA saw the most positive growth. These two grade levels are two of those that had the lowest increases in enrollment during the pandemic. The majority of these students have been with DVIA for at least three years. These students have positively responded to the instructional outreach for individualized instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Absenteeism is the singular focus having the most deleterious effect on achievement.

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

Address absenteeism more aggressively, ELA proficiency for all grades, Algebra and Geometry proficiency growth, and grade 3 reading.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Absenteeism. The school's standing Attendance and Academic Intervention Team (AAIT) regular meeting schedule will begin reviewing attendance issues by October 15 and Academic progress by October 30.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Reduce chronic absenteeism to less than 20%.

Monitoring:

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

The school-based Academic and Attendance Intervention Team meets bi-weekly beginning in October and weekly thereafter. This team is composed of counselors, teachers, and admin. There is a defined 5-tiered process that will be enforced to include direct communications with parents much more aggressively than in prior year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mark Ertel (ertelm@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Student and Parent conferences with the AAIT. Student and parent contracts will identify specific goals for them to meet. Follow up student and parent conferences will be held as needed following review of students' data to ensure the contract is being met.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The foundation for positive improvement in absenteeism is the parent conference with the AAIT. Helping the parent truly learn/understand the role they play in virtual/online learning is key to the student's success.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Facilitate the AAIT regular meetings. Prior to the AAIT October meetings, teachers will directly monitor the student's attendance and academic progress. They will reach out directly to those students and parents identified and begin direct interventions on a standards-based level to get students back on track or to address specific academic needs through small group or individual instruction.

Person Responsible: Cyteria McSwain (mcswainc3@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly AAIT meetings beginning in mid-October when adequate data is available to support the interventions. These meetings will continue through the school year.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Literacy and attendance. Attendance is our school's primary challenge in overcoming the obstacles to literacy. We will address attendance through the AAIT process. Student support will be driven by the academic needs using individual direct instruction and through the use of small group instruction focusing on the specific standards needing to be addressed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

A 5 percent increase in the achievement level of this subgroup.

Monitoring:

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

The AAIT process combined with regular teacher and student interaction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cyteria McSwain (mcswainc3@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Direct instruction driven by literacy data from the PMA's and teacher identified needs. This instruction will be facilitated by a combination of individual and small group direct instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Direct instruction allows for focused interventions on the standards of which the students need to achieve proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

The AAIT will facilitate the process of review of the needs of the students in this group for absenteeism and academic progress.

Person Responsible: Cyteria McSwain (mcswainc3@duvalschools.org)

By When: The AAIT process will begin in early October and continue through the school year.

#3. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Mathematics, algebra, and geomtery achievement levels of the lower quartile as identified through PMA's and PM's and school-based assessments within the curriculum. Students identified as needing support will be monitored weekly for academic growth by the teachers for interventions as needed including small group and individual instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

A 5 percent increase in the bottom quartile of all combined subgroups in mathematics, algebra, and geometry achievement.

Monitoring:

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

AAIT will review the students' progress during their weekly meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cyteria McSwain (mcswainc3@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Direct instruction through individual and small groups as needed through review of standards-based progress and the monitoring of AAIT student and parent contracts as appropriate.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Direct instruction through individual and small group instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

School admin will work with district staff to facilitate the implementation of appropriate resources and the related funding.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Focus on all students below proficiency in state or district testing. Teachers will facilitate bi-weekly team meetings to review students' greatest needs. Teachers will then facilitate direct and explicit reading instruction, individual or in small groups in the virtual classroom or at the DVIA Live Campus. Teachers will also facilitate our DVIA Parent Learning Coach philosophy for all parents of K-2 students.

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

Focus on all students below proficiency in state or district testing. Grade level small group instruction with a focus on the lower quartile students. These small groups will be offered in-person and/or online team grouping. Teachers will also facilitate our DVIA Parent Learning Coach philosophy for all parents of grades 3-5 students.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Using the PMP system to monitor those below proficiency to increase the reading proficiency in each grade level by 5% on the assigned annual assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Using PMP system to monitor those below proficiency to increase the reading achievement level by 5% on the statewide ELA assessment.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Peer instructional review of student achievement via FRECKLE, Waterford, and/or I-Ready will be led by the Kindergarten teacher for teachers within grade band of K-2 and fifth grade teacher for grades 3-5. These reviews will produce next steps for the lower performing students to include parents.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dake, Mary C, dakem@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

Collaborative planning during the monthly PD day. Read Aloud in virtual and in-person sessions to include follow up from parent; Interactive Reading using prior format; Sight Words practice with parent and video taping for review by teacher. Small group direct instruction to support those practices will be facilitated as indicated by the data from the PMP assessments.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

These practices are shown to have a direct positive growth pattern on young readers.

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
Facilitate the use of reading groups for in-person and/or virtual implementation of read aloud and interactive reading opportunities.	Dake, Mary C, dakem@duvalschools.org
Host parent/teacher meetings to address the role of the parent as "learning coach" for their student(s).	Dake, Mary C, dakem@duvalschools.org
Monitor the available assessment data to discern student positive movement and identify those students needing more intensive support	Dake, Mary C, dakem@duvalschools.org

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No