Love Grove Elementary School

2021-22 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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	99%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Emanuel-Wright, Tiffany	Principal	
McClain Richmond, Tiffanie	Assistant Principal	
Osorio Burns, Luz	School Counselor	
Duffy, Jill	Teacher, ESE	Supported Level of Academics (SLA) and Physically Impaired (PI)

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

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

321

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

4

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

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	66	51	52	48	48	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	331
Attendance below 90 percent	0	24	26	21	21	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	8	34	27	23	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	12	33	24	26	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	8	34	27	23	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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	11	33	24	26	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128

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	3	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/20/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				40%	50%	57%	44%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	56%	58%	48%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	50%	53%	48%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				47%	62%	63%	47%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				50%	63%	62%	42%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	52%	51%	29%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				44%	48%	53%	45%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	24%	51%	-27%	58%	-34%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	52%	-10%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2021					
	2019	25%	50%	-25%	56%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	52%	61%	-9%	62%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	64%	-9%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	25%	57%	-32%	60%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	35%	49%	-14%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

First Grade - I-Ready Reading and I-Ready Math
Second Grade - I-Ready Reading and I-Ready Math
Third Grade - PMA Reading and PMA Math
Fourth Grade - PMA Reading and PMA Math
Fifth Grade - PMA Reading, PMA Math, and PMA Science

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14%	21%	26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	15%	13%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	10%	29%
	English Language Learners	0%	10%	11%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5%	12%	25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3%	7%	8%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	11%	25%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	11%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14%	26%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	23%	41%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	17%	46%
	English Language Learners	5%	12%	18%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7%	17%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	17%	29%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	8%	33%
	English Language Learners	5%	6%	18%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22%	19%	26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	26%	34%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	13%	10%	5%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26%	27%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	26%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	6%	15%	14%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27%	35%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	44%	26%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	30%	0%
	English Language Learners	18%	8%	8%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35%	25%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39%	31%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	18%	20%	13%
	English Language Learners	17%	0%	27%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36%	39%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36%	38%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	9%	17%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32%	34%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%	34%	48%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	9%	25%
	English Language Learners	17%	17%	36%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40%	36%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43%	37%	28%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	17%	17%
	English Language Learners	9%	9%	0%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	24	26		22	61		28				
ELL	22	31		47	77		18				
BLK	36	43		28	60		15				
HSP	25	29		48	50		33				
WHT	40	60		45	75		38				
FRL	37	48	50	42	64	73	26				
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				

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
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	389
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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	52
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

A trend that emerges across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas is our consistently low level of students meeting 50% or more proficiency. An area of focus for Love Grove has been to increase Reading, Math and Science proficiency to overall above 50% proficiency. Specifically, our intermediate students who are economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities (SWDs), and English Language Learners (ELLs).

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

A data component demonstrating the greatest need for improvement is overall proficiency and gains for our intermediate students in Reading to include students who are economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities (SWDs), and English Language Learners (ELLs).

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

A few contributing factors to this need for improvement include the following:
*Instructional inconsistencies with in-person and online learning
*Student attendance and mobility
*Online students not engaged in Corrective Reading.

Action Steps:
*All students engaged in in-person learning
*All teachers delivering Corrective Reading and Acaletics instruction
*All teachers fully immersed in Standards-Aligned instructional practices
*Addressing student attendance and mobility concerns

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

A data component demonstrating the most improvement would be our primary students consistent growth within Reading and Math to include increased proficiency and learning gains from Fall to Spring assessments.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement include more primary students engaging in in-person learning to include Reading Mastery Signature Edition (RMSE). In addition, fidelity use of I-Ready Math with applicable tools and next steps in instruction aligned to our daily curriculum.

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

The following strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning:
*Administration, Teachers, Students and Families will partner to accelerate learning.
*Administration will provide relevant standards-aligned professional development and add a standards-based school Instructional Coach.

*Teachers will delivered standards-aligned, rigorous, and grade-level appropriate instruction (B.E.S.T & FL. Standards).
*Teachers will will differentiate instruction and provide adequately aligned lessons/tasks to bridge learning gaps.
*Teachers will deliver instructional interventions and supplements such Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, Acaletics and Blended Learning (I-Ready, Achieve 3000, Freckle, Vizzle, etc.)

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The following professional development opportunities will be provided at Love Grove to support teachers and leaders:
*Common Planning and Professional Learning Communities focused on Learning Arc Protocols and Standards-Aligned Instruction.
*Early Release Day trainings with choice options for professional develop in Reading, Math and Science.
*Teacher Planning and Grade Level collaboration.
*Data Assessment Team access to progress monitoring training using Performance Matters and FOCUS
*Full Implementation of Multi-Tiered Support Services.
*Culturally Responsive Teaching book study and instructional best practices.

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

The following additional services will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond:
*Consistent reinforcement of instructional current systems.
*Increased Progress Monitoring.
*Maintaining current instructional staff in an appropriate grade level fit.
*Addition of a standards-based school Instructional Coach.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional Practice is an essential component in driving effectiveness and fidelity standards-based instruction in Reading/ELA. Therefore, standards-aligned instructional practices will be utilized with the Florida Standards and B.E.S.T. Standards. 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 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 school year are as follows: *Reading: Direct Instruction - Reading Mastery Signature Edition (RMSE) - Grades K-2 *Reading: Direct Instruction - Corrective Reading - Grades 3-5 *Exceptional Student Education: Unique Learning System (ULS) and Direct Instruction
Measurable Outcome:	Reading Proficiency for the 2020-2021 school year was 35%. Learning Gains were 47% and BQ Learning Gains were 46%. Student Achievement Goal (Reading): Increase Reading Proficiency to 50% or above, Learning Gains to 60% and BQ Learning Gains to 60%.
Monitoring:	Our Reading Interventionist, Nicole Fuller and our instructional Paraprofessional will be responsible for monitoring the desired outcome. Measuring Up consumable Reading materials will be utilized as a tutoring supplement to assess student mastery.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Fuller (dickinsonn@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, Achieve 3000, Mastery Checks for RMSE and Corrective Reading)
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)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional Practice is an essential component in driving effectiveness and fidelity standards-based instruction in Math. Therefore, standards-aligned instructional practices will be utilized with the Florida Standards and B.E.S.T. Standards. 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 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 school year are as follows: *Math: Acaletics - Grades 2-5 *Math: I-Ready Math *Math: Freckle/Star, Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) - Grade 4-5 *Exceptional Student Education: Unique Learning System (ULS) and Direct Instruction
Measurable Outcome:	Math Proficiency for the 2020-2021 school year was 41%. Learning Gains were 63% and BQ Learning Gains were 79%. Student Achievement Goal (Math): Increase Math Proficiency to 50% or above, Learning Gains to 70% and BQ Learning Gains to 85%.
Monitoring:	Our Math Interventionist, Anne Nessler and our instructional Paraprofessional will be responsible for monitoring the desired outcome. Measuring Up consumable Math materials will be utilized as a tutoring supplement to assess student mastery.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anne Nessler (nessler@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/Star 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)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional Practice is an essential component in driving effectiveness and fidelity standards-based instruction in Science. Therefore, standards-aligned instructional practices will be utilized with the New Generation Sunshine State Standards. 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 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 school year are as follows: *Science: Science Investigations and Labs Grades K-5 *Science: Science Gizmos Grades K-5 *Science: Science Fair Grades K-5 *Science: PITSCO Lab Grade 5 *Exceptional Student Education: Unique Learning System (ULS) and Direct Instruction
Measurable Outcome:	Science Proficiency for the 2020-2021 school year was 26%. (Science): Increase Science Proficiency to 50% or above
Monitoring:	Our School Principal, Tiffany Emanuel-Wright and our instructional Paraprofessional will be responsible for monitoring the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tiffany Emanuel-Wright (emanuelt@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Master Schedules will include daily Science Instruction based on Investigations and NGSSS Standards, a standards-based continuous improvement model, supplemental instructional Science programs, labs and project-based lessons.
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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. 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.
Monitoring:	Our School Principal, Tiffany Emanuel-Wright and our Parent Liaison, Marisol Chang will be responsible for monitoring the desired outcome.
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-	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

based Strategy: 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 Tiffany Emanuel-Wright (emanuelt@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Love Grove Elementary reported 0.2 incidents per 100 students. Therefore, when compared to elementary schools statewide, Love Grove Elementary falls into the low category for school incident rankings.

Primary Area of Concern:
Continue to maintain low incidences of in-school and out-of-school suspensions and enhance restorative behavior practices through highly effective implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS).

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.

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 and decrease adverse behaviors.

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.

At Love Grove Elementary, we realize that 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.

The following systems address this effort:

* Collaborative Planning and Professional Learning Communities
* Faculty and Staff Meetings
* In-Service and Early Release Day Trainings
* Sunshine Committee and other Faculty & Staff Engagement events
* Teacher-Led Professional Development and Teacher/Staff Leadership Initiatives
* Parent and Family Engagement School Events
* Parent Teacher Association (PTA)
* School Advisory Council (SAC)
* Full Service Schools - Student and Family Support
* Faith-Based and Community Partnership Support

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

School Leadership Team:
Principal
Assistant Principal
School Counselor
ESE Lead Teacher

Teacher Leadership Teams:
Professional Learning Communities
Sunshine Committee

Full Service Schools:
School Therapist
Site Coordinator, Englewood Full Service

Faith-Based Partners
Community Business Partners

https://www.floridacims.org