

Duval County Public Schools

Loretto Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Loretto Elementary School

3900 LORETTO RD, Jacksonville, FL 32223

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

Demographics

Principal: Tammy Haberman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: A (76%)
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 was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Loretto Elementary School

3900 LORETTO RD, Jacksonville, FL 32223

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">34%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">35%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

Loretto Elementary School as part of the Duval County Public Schools is committed to providing differentiated, standards-based instruction that will allow all students to achieve their goals and use their knowledge to be successful in a culturally diverse and technologically-advanced world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Loretto Elementary the school, home and community will work together to provide a safe and successful academic environment, which is committed to assisting in development of each student while exploring the social and technological world around them.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kemp, Kristie	Principal	The principal's main responsibilities included: promoting and maintaining high student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing and communicating information to enforce school, District and State policies; maintaining a safe school environment; coordinating site activities and communicating information to staff, students, parents and community members.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	155	170	147	171	183	167	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	993
Attendance below 90 percent	14	18	7	19	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	3	1	1	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	18	45	42	45	60	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	276

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	1	9	22	21	15	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	2	4	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	4	1	4	8	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

58

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/22/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	14	19	27	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	9	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	1	3	19	29	33	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	77%	50%	57%	76%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	56%	58%	60%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	50%	53%	37%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	79%	62%	63%	76%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	63%	62%	55%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	52%	51%	46%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	68%	48%	53%	59%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	155 (0)	170 (0)	147 (0)	171 (0)	183 (0)	167 (0)	993 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	14 ()	18 ()	7 ()	19 ()	15 ()	19 ()	92 (0)
One or more suspensions	3 ()	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	15 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 ()	7 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	18 ()	45 (0)	42 (0)	45 (0)	60 (0)	66 (0)	276 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	80%	51%	29%	58%	22%
	2018	77%	50%	27%	57%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	52%	21%	58%	15%
	2018	80%	49%	31%	56%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	77%	50%	27%	56%	21%
	2018	72%	51%	21%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	61%	25%	62%	24%
	2018	73%	59%	14%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	64%	17%	64%	17%
	2018	85%	60%	25%	62%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	66%	57%	9%	60%	6%
	2018	68%	61%	7%	61%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	66%	49%	17%	53%	13%
	2018	76%	56%	20%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	46	46	48	55	54	37	54				
ELL	80	48		72	60	40	43				
ASN	78	63		95	74						
BLK	65	57	36	56	50	47	57				
HSP	77	64	36	83	67	30	56				
MUL	70	56		80	63						
WHT	79	65	58	80	65	47	73				
FRL	65	59	54	69	59	43	55				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	48	46	23	55	51	31	63				
ELL	62	53	58	76	53						
ASN	80	71		87	59						
BLK	69	65	56	58	52	36	65				
HSP	76	67		84	61		73				
MUL	94	63		82	53		80				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
WHT	77	62	38	77	64	50	78				
FRL	67	57	47	65	60	44	65				
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	45	41	28	38	38	32	13				
ELL	45	38	38	77	50						
ASN	88	68		94	77		86				
BLK	56	38	21	58	44	35	31				
HSP	74	68		69	62		31				
MUL	72	72		76	61						
WHT	79	61	37	77	53	49	63				
FRL	65	48	36	64	51	45	43				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
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	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	523
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

LPQ Math - 46%. Our veteran ESE Support Facilitator retired in December 2018 and a brand new teacher took her position. The average number of students in the 5th grade classes were 25. Due to budget restraints our school based tutor did not begin instructional support until late November.

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

Science- We decreased 9 points, however we were still 23 points above the district average. Each 5th grade class had an average of 25 students. 3 out of 7 classes were taught by a dedicated Science teacher. The data from the PMA1 and PMA2 was positive and showing mastery for 70 % of our students.

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.

Loretto Elementary is fortunate not to have any substantial data components below the state average. However we have one data component , Math LPQ where we are 1% above the state averages.

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

Reading LPQ Gains increased 5 %. Provided prescriptive lessons in a small group setting. School base tutor worked with LPQ in Science Vocabulary and Achieve 3000 Monitor and rewarded students Bi-weekly with Achieve 3000. Students data chats and goal setting. All students were held accountable for their academic performance. Additional support from parent volunteer. All LPQ students were required to complete I-ready reading lessons.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

One of our potential areas of concerns is number of 3rd, 4th and 5th students scoring level 1 on the state assessment. We will continue to monitor our LPQ and provide additional support to these students.

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

1. Science
2. Math LPQ
3. 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students scoring Level 1 on the State Assessment.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Performance on the Science FSA
Rationale	Loretto Elementary decreased 9 points last year on the Science FSA.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Loretto's Science FSA goal for the 2019-2020 school year is to increase 7 points and attain a 75% proficiency of this assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristie Kemp (kempk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Monitor student performance on each end of 9 weeks PMA. Identify students who are struggling and provide support to before and after school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our upcoming 4th and 5th grade students scored 77% proficiency in Reading in 2018-2019., therefore reading the science curriculum should not be a struggle for most. Our students should be able to master the standards through reading the content and participating in experiments.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 5th grade has priority securing time in the New Science Lab 2. PTA volunteer will help set up materials for teachers to use the Science Lab 3. Admin will monitor scores from each PMA after every 9 weeks 4. School will conduct a Science Boot camp in the spring 5. Science teachers will host an after school Stem/Science club
Person Responsible	Kristie Kemp (kempk@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	
Rationale	
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).