Love Grove Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Love Grove Elementary School

2446 UNIVERSITY BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32216

http://www.duvalschools.org/lovegrove

Demographics

Principal: Kendall Parris

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2019-20 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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Love Grove Elementary School

2446 UNIVERSITY BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32216

http://www.duvalschools.org/lovegrove

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	B

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.

Mission: To provide educational excellence in every school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.
This will be accomplished through our collective concentration on our vision for of excellent instruction designed to foster student success in every classroom when students are:
Provided a safe and healthy learning environment
Equipped with social and emotional learning resources
Fully engaged in standards-based instruction
Working on grade appropriate rigorous content
Taking ownership of their learning and achievement goals
Demonstrating understanding of the content and applying the knowledge

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and life.
This will be accomplished through sustaining a culture of high academic achievement, instructional goal setting and college/career focused learning fostered by our STEAM theme. Concentration within the STEAM content areas (science, technology, engineering, arts and math) will inspire and prepare our students for success in the classroom and in life.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Emanuel-Wright, Tiffany	Principal	Academic Achievement for All Students Instructional Support for All Teachers Partnership for All Parents and Families Transparency for All Stakeholders and Community/Faith-Based Partners
Duffy, Jill	Teacher, ESE	ESE Lead Teacher
Summers, Janet	School Counselor	School Counselor
Edmunds, Darrell	Assistant Principal	School Administrator
Nessler, Anne	Teacher, K-12	Math Interventionist
Fuller, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	Reading Interventionist

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/1/2014, Kendall Parris

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
29

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2019-20 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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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](#).

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	54	58	63	64	64	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	356
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	6	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	4	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/31/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	71	76	65	63	58	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393
Attendance below 90 percent	26	23	19	13	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	2	7	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	17	52	41	46	36	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	238

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	11	41	32	31	26	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	178

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	11	12	22	93	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Number of students enrolled	71	76	65	63	58	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393
Attendance below 90 percent	26	23	19	13	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	2	7	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	17	52	41	46	36	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	238

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	11	41	32	31	26	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	178

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	11	12	22	93	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
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
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	40%	50%	57%	45%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	56%	58%	57%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	50%	53%	60%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	47%	62%	63%	49%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	63%	62%	64%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	52%	51%	65%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	48%	53%	41%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	24%	51%	-27%	58%	-34%
	2018	37%	50%	-13%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	52%	-10%	58%	-16%
	2018	30%	49%	-19%	56%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	25%	50%	-25%	56%	-31%
	2018	38%	51%	-13%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	61%	-9%	62%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	49%	59%	-10%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	64%	-9%	64%	-9%
	2018	41%	60%	-19%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	25%	57%	-32%	60%	-35%
	2018	36%	61%	-25%	61%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	49%	-14%	53%	-18%
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	55%	-10%
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	41	58	57	33	47	54	50				
ELL	29	55	43	46	58	45	50				
ASN	50	67		57	50						
BLK	49	61		33	36		46				
HSP	31	50	46	50	58	36	44				
WHT	39	55	54	57	54		31				
FRL	37	52	50	50	54	50	42				
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	38	38	30	31	38		24				
ELL	38	59		54	45						
ASN	27			55							
BLK	53	35		38	27		43				
HSP	37	59		49	44		45				
WHT	42	52		53	55		47				
FRL	42	44	42	49	43	29	47				

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	14	45		26	59	70					
ELL	35	53		56	71						
BLK	42	63		45	58	46	38				
HSP	31	42		48	65						
WHT	56	62		52	72		47				
FRL	42	52	56	47	64	70	39				

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	50
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	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	56
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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	48
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Data components from 2018-19 showing lowest performance included: ELA school-wide achievement (40%); Science school-wide achievement (44%); Math gains by lowest performing quartile (46%); ELL ELA Achievement (29%); Math achievement among Black students (33%). Contributing factors toward school-wide achievement include higher concentration of students in ELL and ESE categories.

NOTE: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, state testing in 2020 was cancelled. Interim assessments administered mid-year at the district level produced increased projections of ELA (42%) and Science school-wide achievement (60%) as well as Math LPQ gains (81%).

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from 2017-18 to 2018-19 was ELA school-wide proficiency (-4%); contributing factors included high ELL and ESE populations.

NOTE: Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, state testing in 2020 was cancelled. Interim assessments at mid-year projected a decline in school-wide math proficiency from 47% in 2019 to 38% in 2020.

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.

In 2019, ELA proficiency showed the greatest gap compared to the state average (40% school to 57% state). Contributing factors included high ELL and ESE populations.

NOTE: Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, state testing in 2020 was cancelled. Interim assessments at mid-year projected a decline in school-wide math proficiency from 47% in 2019 to 38% in 2020. This would have resulted in the greatest gap as compared to 2019 state average (63%).

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

Bottom quartile math showed the most improvement, from 29% in 2018 to 46% in 2019. The school had/has a math interventionist and ESE VE teacher targeting the bottom quartile in math.

NOTE: Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, state testing in 2020 was cancelled. Interim assessments at mid-year projected an improvement in Math lowest performing quartile growth (81%), which would have been a 35-point increase over 2019 state scores. This could be attributed to the implementation of comprehensive standards-based instruction walks as well as the Acaletics math curriculum.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Reflecting on the EWS in 2019, the biggest area of concern was the amount of students whose attendance is under 90%.
In 2020, concerns over attendance were compounded by implications from the COVID-19 pandemic, in which access to instruction was highly inequitable along lines of language and socio-economic status.

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

1. Flexible, dependable access to quality instruction (COVID considerations)
2. Math competency
3. ELA competency
4. Attendance and engagement across learning models
5. Parent involvement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional Practice is an essential component in driving effectiveness and fidelity standards-based instruction. In addition, applying differentiated instructional practices addresses deficit standards and allows students to perform at independent instructional levels while working towards grade level expectations. Therefore, several research-based intervention/remediation instructional programs will be implemented again during the 2020-2021 school year. In addition, the school will again dedicate specific time during the instructional school day for a school-wide and classroom-specific remediation block. The intervention/remediation instructional programs the will be utilized during the 2020-2021 school year are as follows: *Reading: Direct Instruction - Reading Mastery Signature Edition (RMSE) - Grades K-2 *Reading: Direct Instruction - Corrective Reading - Grades 3-5 *Math: Acaletics - Grades 2-5 *Math: Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) - Grade 4 *Exceptional Student Education: Unique Learning System (ULS) and Direct Instruction
Measurable Outcome:	Reading Proficiency for the 2018-2019 school year was 40%. Learning Gains were 55% and BQ Learning Gains were 54%. Student Achievement Goal (Reading): Increase Reading Proficiency to 47% or above, Learning Gains to 60% and BQ Learning Gains to 60%. Math Proficiency for the 2018-2019 school year was 47%. Learning Gains were 50% and BQ Learning Gains were 46%. Student Achievement Goal (Math): Increase Math Proficiency to 50% or above, Learning Gains to 58% and BQ Learning Gains to 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Emanuel-Wright (emanuelt@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Master Schedules will include a Direct Instruction intervention block in Reading (Corrective Reading or Reading Mastery Signature Edition), Florida standards-based continuous improvement model (FCIM) in Math, supplemental instructional Math program (Acaletics), and standards-based Core Curriculum instruction in both Reading (LAFS) and Math (Eureka & MAFS).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Evidence-based Strategy is proven through research-based implementation practices. District data generated from DCPS schools supports increased student achievement and school grade as a result of the instructional resources and practices outlined.

Action Steps to Implement

Reading:
The school-based Reading Interventionist will provide instructional and intervention support for students in Reading through fidelity utilization and data analysis of our direction instruction programs: Corrective Reading (CR) and Reading Mastery Signature Edition (RMSE). Corrective Reading is provided as a reading intervention for intermediate students (3rd-5th) and Reading Mastery Signature Edition is provided as a reading intervention for primary students (K-2nd). The school-based Reading Interventionist will also track blended learning data in I-Ready and Achieve 3000 and provide student instructional support within the core LAFS curriculum. A part-time paraprofessional will also support teachers in the classroom with small group intervention instruction. ESE classroom teachers are supported by paraprofessionals who also provide instructional support.

Person Responsible	Nicole Fuller (dickinsonn@duvalschools.org)

Math:

The school-based Math Interventionist will provide instructional and intervention support for students in Math through fidelity utilization and data analysis of our Math instructional/supplemental programs: Standards-based FCIM Cycle and Acaletics. The standards-based Florida continuous improvement model is provided as a 4th grade math remediation of standards and Acaletics is provided to grades second through fifth as an instructional supplement to core Eureka and MAFS curriculum. The school-based Math Interventionist will also track blended learning data in I-Ready and Freckle and provide student instructional support within the core Eureka and MAFS curriculum. A part-time paraprofessional will also support teachers in the classroom with small group intervention instruction. ESE classroom teachers are supported by paraprofessionals who also provide instructional support.

Person Responsible Anne Nessler (nessler@duvalschools.org)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	John Hattie's research in Visible Learning states that collective Teacher Efficacy generates a 1.57 effect size as collective teacher efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement. As teachers establish strong belief systems in the effectiveness of their practice students increase their beliefs in learning. Therefore, to increase school-based teacher efficacy, opportunities for teachers to give and receive appropriate feedback, collaborate with leadership, and apply instructional strategies must be emphasized. Leadership will work in conjunction with teachers to ensure that Collaborative Planning and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) address the following: *What do we want students to know and be able to do? *How do we know if students have learned? *How do we respond when students don't learn? *How do we respond when students have learned? Furthermore, Hattie's research also indicates a direct correlation or alignment of increased teacher efficacy with increased student efficacy which ultimately impacts teacher-student relationships. Teacher-Student Relationships generate a 0.72 effect size which promotes relevant student conversations and feedback that supports increased student achievement. The Leadership response to specific Teacher Feedback will be continuous.
Measurable Outcome:	The specific measurable outcome to indicate progress in this area of focus will be evident in student assessment results (I-Ready, Achieve, Freckle, Corrective Reading, Acaletics, PMA) and 5 Essentials teacher survey data specific to Effective Leadership. At present, Teacher-Principal Trust and Instructional Leadership were the lowest scoring measures indicated on the 5 Essentials teacher survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Emanuel-Wright (emanuelt@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Planning and Professional Learning Communities will focus on the "Six Elements of an Effective PLC" to ensure that Leadership and Teachers will: *Work collaboratively rather than in isolation, take collective responsibility for student learning, and clarify the commitments they make to each other about how they will work together. *Work interdependently to achieve common goals for which all members are mutually accountable. *Ensure that All students have access to the same knowledge and skills regardless of the teacher to whom they are assigned. *Develop common formative assessments to frequently gather evidence of student learning. *Create a system of interventions and extensions to ensure students who struggle receive additional time and support for learning in a way that is timely, directive, diagnostic, and systematic, and students who demonstrate proficiency can extend their learning. *Use evidence of student learning to inform and improve individual and collective practice of the team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is as follows: Teacher Efficacy effect size 1.57. Needs Assessment derived from the 5 Essentials Survey

Action Steps to Implement

5 Essentials: Effective Leader
Teacher-Principal Trust and Instructional Leadership
An Instructional Teacher Leadership Team will be developed to include a teacher representative from each grade level and ESE to promote thoughtful discussion relevant to instructional and student achievement needs.
Vertical Instructional Rounding will be included in Collaborative Planning and Professional Learning Communities to promote appropriate application of Learning Arc protocols within a Coaching Cycle design format.

Person Responsible Tiffany Emanuel-Wright (emanuelt@duvalschools.org)

5 Essentials: Effective Leader
Program Coherence and Teacher Influence
Teachers will be provided with the necessary instructional program materials on the first day of instruction.
Master Schedules will be concise, grade-level appropriate and include teacher scheduling feedback.
Teachers will be provided efficient testing/assessment procedures and timely assessment feedback.

Person Responsible Darrell Edmunds (edmunds@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Establishing and sustaining a positive School Culture and Environment are integral components of a thriving school community. Students and Teachers must feel safe and supported in an educationally responsive environment where hard work is valued and academic performance is celebrated. To support this effort, parents must have voice in the process. Therefore, our school-wide area of focus would be to increase parent involvement through effective strategies that promote positive and accessible parent and family engagement opportunities. Those strategies are as follows: *Increase parent and family representation within the School Advisory Council (SAC) and the Parent Teacher Association (PTA). Goal: A parent representation from each grade level and ESE. *Provide flexible and accessible meeting times for SAC and PTA and other school-related events/meetings utilizing a face-to-face option and/or a virtual option. Off site meeting options will also be open for discussion. *Provide Teach the Parent school-based workshops to support parents and families with accessing FOCUS, understanding curriculum and assessments, assistance with providing homework and home learning support for students, access to Full Service Schools resources, and access to ESE and ESOL support services. *Provide parents with ongoing access to Parent Academy program options and access to the Parents Who Lead Panel (PWLP) to promote parent and family leadership in schools.
Measurable Outcome:	The specific measurable outcome to indicate progress in this area of focus will be evident in parent and family engagement event participation and surveys, parent access to FOCUS and school-based website/social media platforms, enrollment and referral services, and 5 Essentials parent survey data specific to Involved Families. At present, 5 Essentials Survey data relating to Involved Families indicates a very weak performance rating. Goal: Attain a very strong performance rating through partnering with parents and valuing parent input.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Emanuel-Wright (emanuelt@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The school will build authentic relationships with parents and families based on a culture and environment specifically relating to parent involvement to create a student learning partnership that fosters a thriving school community. As referenced in the 5 Essentials School Impact Survey, schools with involved families have an entire staff that builds strong external relationships. For example, *Parents are seen as partners who help students learn *Parent input and participation is valued in advancing the school's mission *Parents are provided support efforts to strengthen student community resources
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is as follows: According to the 5 Essentials Survey, there are five essential areas that are leading indicators to continuous school improvement: Supportive Environment, Ambitious Instruction, Effective Leaders, Involved Families, and Collaborative Teachers. These 5 Essentials support school success and the perspectives and processes central to the delivery and support of student learning. Needs Assessment derived from the 5 Essentials School Impact Survey indicate Involved Families as very weak.
Action Steps to Implement	

Parent and Family Engagement: Parent Liaison (additional person responsible)
School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings, Parent Teacher Association (PTA) meetings, Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) meetings/events and all other school-based events will be communicated and

marketed utilizing various modes of transmission (e.g. school marquee, event flyers, social media, website, Parent Link (telephone/email/text), Peachjar, etc.). Meetings and events will be offered in flexible formats (date, time, face-to-face, virtual, etc.). PFEP and Title I events will be documented and surveyed to allow for quantifiable results.

Person Responsible Darrell Edmunds (edmunds@duvalschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Standards-aligned instruction provides clearly defined goals and objectives for students to support academic achievement. As such, clear and well-structured instructional practices will encourage students to build and apply knowledge. This is most effective when the following actions are in place to impact student learning: *Instruction is well-defined with clear expectations for student success, *Instruction is interactive and encourages students to build and apply knowledge, *Instruction is well-paced (not measured), and *Instruction is aligned across grades (not measured). Per the 5 Essentials Survey, students indicated high performance ratings as it relates to Math and ELA Instruction with Math being very strong (83) and ELA strong (76). As a focus, schools with strong Math instruction must allow students to interact with course material and one another to build and apply knowledge. Conversely, schools with strong English instruction must allow students to interact with course materials and one another to build and apply critical reading and writing skills.
Measurable Outcome:	In order to support continued success with student indicators of high performance ratings with regards to instructional practice in Math and ELA, 100% of classroom teachers (Gen Ed/ESE) will engage in continuous/fidelity Standards-Aligned Instruction (FL Standards/ B.E.S.T. Standards), and they will support this practice through continuous professional development (collaborative planning, professional learning communities (PLCs), standards-based instructional rounding (vertical), and implementation of research-based practices).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Emanuel-Wright (emanuelt@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	School-Based Leadership Team will continue our professional practice with standards-based instruction utilizing our Standards Walkthrough Tool (SWT) and engage in regional School Improvement Rounds to support our work navigating the Standards-Based School Continuum (Calibrated Administration, Collaborative Administration, Standards-Based Planning, Aligned Observations). Teachers will collaborate in grade-level teams with school leadership to continue fidelity work with analyzing SWT data as it pertains to aligned standards-based instruction and expand their work, knowledge and application of "Learning Arcs" to standards-aligned daily instruction. Evidence and Artifacts: Completed Learning Arcs protocols, Differentiated and Annotated Lesson Plans with Small Group Plans, Assessment Data (IReady & Freckle Diagnostic & Iterim)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Per the purpose and foundation of our Florida Standards and newly adopted B.E.S.T. Standards, the school leadership must ensure that students are engaged in rigorous and content-rich English Language Arts and Math standards with a renewed focus on Reading at the core of the standards development process and an increased focus on foundational Math computational skills.
Action Steps to Implement	

Administration will conduct weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and Common Planning (CPs) focused on standards-aligned instruction utilizing the Learning Arcs Protocol, Data Analysis and Student Work. Grade level and Content area teams will meet with administration on weekly Thursdays during their designated Resource Time. Meetings will alternate each week between PLC and CP collaboration time. Tangible learning products will be produced to include: standards-aligned assignments, tasks, assessments and learning arc models.

Person Responsible Tiffany Emanuel-Wright (emanuelt@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The school leadership team will address the school-wide improvement priorities through collaboration with content-area teachers with the support of both the Reading and Math Interventionist.

Math and ELA proficiency - In addition to the above areas of focus, the leadership team will continue to conduct regular standards-based walkthroughs and corresponding discussions with teachers to ensure access to appropriate rigor of instruction. This will develop skills in students to meet proficiency requirements in state testing and thus increase achievement scores.

Attendance and engagement across learning models - as part of the school's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), the school's Leadership and Collaborative Problem-Solving Team (CPST) will work with the Parent Liaison to further develop its system of outreach and engagement for students with low attendance and other early warning indicators.

Equitable, quality instruction - As the school year starts on a model of offering the choice of full-time face-to-face or online instruction, the leadership team will work with MTSS, PTA and SAC as described above to actively pursue quality instruction for all students. The school will place particular emphasis on student subgroups whose learning was detrimentally affected during the spring rollout of distance learning and are still at risk – students with significant disabilities and English Students of Other Languages (ESOL) whose families have struggled surmounting the language barrier.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Love Grove Elementary realizes the importance of a positive school culture and environment. Therefore, Love Grove leadership strives to continuously address building and sustaining a positive school culture and environment that involves all stakeholders in the following ways:
* Professional Learning Communities and Collaborative Planning - Allows grade level and content area

teams to learn and plan together, sharing best practices and expertise and celebrating what works for students.

* SAC and PTA - Allows parents and other involved stakeholders to contribute to continuous school improvement
* Magnificent Manatee - Recognizes a student of the month from each homeroom who exhibits the monthly character trait - parents and families are invited to attend.
* Faith-Based Partnerships - Proud partners with Florida Baptist Children's Home (FBCH), Jacksonville Baptist Association (JBA) and Shiloh Metropolitan Baptist Church (SMBC).
* Community Business Partners - Support school-based initiatives: Car Hang Tags, Teacher & Staff Appreciation, Campus Beautification, etc.
* United Way-Full Service School - Provides support services to both students and families either in school or through home-based by referral.
* YMCA/Team Up - Through a partnership with the Kid's Hope Alliance, providing free after-school academics and enrichment.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement**	$0.00
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**