

Duval County Public Schools

Loretto Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	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: 10/16/2020

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (64%) 2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (64%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
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>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">40%</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="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">39%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bradley, Stacy	Assistant Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity, manages school schedules to use support staff effectively, ensures that the shared decision making process is used effectively, communicates with parents in order to gain a partnership between school and home.
Haberman, Tammy	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity, manages school schedules to use support staff effectively, ensures that the shared decision making process is used effectively, communicates with parents in order to gain a partnership between school and home.
Vincent, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity, manages school schedules to use support staff effectively, ensures that the shared decision making process is used effectively, communicates with parents in order to gain a partnership between school and home.
Vondrasek, Lee Ann	Instructional Coach	Provides K-5 math plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention. Provides assistance to teachers through modeling and implementation of CORE Math lessons, Blended Learning, and math centers

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 10/16/2020, Tammy Haberman

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,003

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

11

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

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	160	176	168	170	147	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	990
Attendance below 90 percent	1	32	23	27	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	1	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	1	2	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	14	36	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	13	29	43	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	1	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/27/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	168	157	158	160	161	193	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	997
Attendance below 90 percent	0	20	14	20	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	8	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	9	25	35	28	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	20	28	57	38	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	34	37	31	52	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	234

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	12	17	43	29	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151

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	2	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	168	157	158	160	161	193	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	997
Attendance below 90 percent	0	20	14	20	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	8	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	9	25	35	28	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	20	28	57	38	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	34	37	31	52	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	234

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	12	17	43	29	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151

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	2	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	70%	50%	56%				77%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%						63%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						51%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	74%	48%	50%				79%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	66%						64%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						46%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	59%	59%	59%				68%	48%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	80%	51%	29%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	73%	52%	21%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2022					
	2019	77%	50%	27%	56%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	86%	61%	25%	62%	24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	81%	64%	17%	64%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2022					
	2019	66%	57%	9%	60%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	66%	49%	17%	53%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	29	45	41	42	59	50	26				
ELL	46	52		69	82						
ASN	91	86		100	95		90				
BLK	60	64		60	68	60	62				
HSP	57	54	40	65	57	46	41				
MUL	68			53							
WHT	72	72	49	76	65	62	61				
FRL	52	65	48	57	64	69	53				
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	29	16	13	48	24	29	24				
ELL	58			68							
ASN	85	77		94	71		92				
BLK	60	50		55	38		50				
HSP	56	61		64	44		53				
MUL	55			55							
WHT	73	56	33	75	49	41	72				
FRL	58	48	33	58	39	47	56				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
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	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	529
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	66
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	92
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	62
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	55

Hispanic Students	
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	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	65
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	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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

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

One trend that emerges across all grade levels and subgroups is less than satisfactory achievement for the Students with Disabilities at 31% proficiency in ELA (10 out of 32) and 31% (10 out of 32) Math. Students achievement increased from the prior year, yet they are still demonstrating a slow rate of improvement.

While our lowest quartile students scores increased from the previous year, they are still struggling to make learning gains in both Reading and Math.

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

Based off the previous years data with improvement in both Reading and Math, ELA LPQ gains is an area that demonstrated the greatest need for improvement, while increasing student learning gains all around.

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

Strategic planning with a Focus on Small Group instruction that addresses all students and focuses on what they need specifically.

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

Based on our previous data, our Learning Gains in ELA showed improvement from 58% of students making gains to 70% percent of student making gains this year, and in Math showed improvement from 50% of students making gains to 66% percent of student making gains this year . Another area that showed continued improvement was Math LPQ Learning Gains going from 35% of LPQ students making gains to 60% of LPQ students making gains this year.

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

Strategic planning of PLCs to focus on small group instruction by teachers, peer observations, data chats and consistent and immediate feedback regarding class visits and instruction during centers.

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

Continued small group interventions focusing on student needs based on data, peer observations (across grade levels and schools), data chats, and continued consistent and immediate feedback regarding class visits and instruction during centers.

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.

Based on the data, we will continue our bi-weekly PLCS and Early Release Professional Development. In Addition, this year we will be adding peer observations across grade levels as well as visits to a partnering school for teachers to allow us to continue to support teachers based on our areas of improvement.

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

We will continue with our Standards/Instructional Coach and 3rd Grade interventionist this year to continue to target needs for both teachers and students. We will continue our quarterly data chats and progress monitoring to help identify interventions that are working and areas of improvement. With our strategic planning of PLCS and peer observations we will continue to ensure that teachers are provided with training and support based on the specific needs of their classrooms.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on our 2022 FSA data, 47% of our LPQ students made growth in reading. We will focus school-wide professional development and collaboration planning sessions around data-driven standard-based small group lessons to ensure students are received remediation. Through full implementation of data-driven standard-based small group lessons, student performance in all academic areas.

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

100% of LES teachers will engage in data-driven standard-based small group lessons, peer observation with data-driven standard-based small group lessons, and analyze student work during common planning. Through this work, LPQ student growth in reading will increase from 47% to 60%.

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

Implementation of the effectiveness of small group instruction and teacher-led instruction will be monitored by admin conducting weekly walkthroughs, monitoring data (school and district), Quarterly Data Chats, and providing teachers with specific and immediate feedback in order to support teachers to ensure student learning and achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Haberman (habermant@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Professional development will be provided for teachers focusing on data-driven standard-based small group lessons and how to analyze student data. Weekly common planning will occur K-5th grade for ELA and Math to align data-driven standard-based small group lessons with current data. Frequent classroom walkthroughs will occur to assess the implementation, quality and fidelity of data-driven standard-based small group lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

According to Visible Learning for Literacy, small group direct instruction effect size is .59. Focusing on data-driven standard-based small group lessons will increase student achievement, therefore, closing the achievement gap.

Action Steps to Implement
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Organize a content area common planning agenda and Peer Observation schedule to model highly effective teaching of data-driven standard-based small group lessons, tasks and formative assessments through peer observations.

Person Responsible Stacy Bradley (bradleys@duvalschools.org)

Utilize standards coach and Assistant Principals on conducting common planning sessions focused data-driven standard-based small group lessons and teacher-led instruction.

Person Responsible Tammy Haberman (habermant@duvalschools.org)

Principal and Assistant Principals will conduct weekly classroom observations using the data-driven standard-based small group lessons walkthrough tool to provide specific feedback to increase quality and fidelity small group instruction and teacher-led instruction.

Person Responsible Tammy Haberman (habermant@duvalschools.org)

Analyze data provided by the Assistant Principals and Standards Coach with Administrative Team during weekly Admin meeting to determine trends and problem solve next steps.

Person Responsible Tammy Haberman (habermant@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: From the 5 Essentials survey one area of focus is improving in the area of Collaborative Teachers. On the survey, we were rated as Neutral in the area of Collaborative Teachers and rated weak specifically in Collective Responsibility. Collective responsibility was the lowest measure in the Collaborative Teachers domain. Collective responsibility scored at a 27, which increased 26 points from the previous year.
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. If teachers are provided with opportunities to collaborate and conduct peer observations, we will see an increase in positive responses on the 5 Essentials Survey.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Administration will use PLCs and Early Release Days to monitor and track teacher participation. Teachers will be expected to include peer observations and PLC meetings in their Individual Professional Development Plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tammy Haberman (habermant@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Creating a professional learning community that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students occurs within learning communities committed to continuous improvement, collective responsibility, and a common goal.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. Based on the results of the 5 Essentials Survey and feedback from Teachers, Teachers expressed a need for a more collaborative culture where they are able to learn from their peers and have the opportunity for planning and collaboration to ensure that trusted relationships can grow and impact student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Administration Team will meet bi-weekly with teachers during PLC to conduct peer observations and collaborative planning to work towards creating a learning community to increase educator effectiveness.

Person Responsible Tammy Haberman (habermant@duvalschools.org)

Administration Team will conduct regular walk-throughs, quarterly data chats, frequent feedback and Leadership meetings to have conversations about instruction in all classrooms.

Person Responsible Tammy Haberman (habermant@duvalschools.org)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

As a school, we will work to improve our overall perspective on school-wide behavior and positive intervention and supports. Utilizing the 5 Essentials teacher survey data, we were rated as Neutral in the area of Collaborative Teachers and rated weak specifically in Collective Responsibility. We will work with teacher leaders to develop a stronger culture and climate that allows teachers to collaborate at their grade level and school-wide to improve student behavior and our approach to PBIS.

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

If teachers are provided with school-wide behavior, and positive interventions and supports through the PBIS model, we will see an increase in developing a stronger culture and climate that allows for teachers to help maintain discipline in the entire school, not just in their classroom as evidenced by their responses on the 2023 5 Essentials Survey.

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

Faculty and Staff monthly conversations will be used to guide discussions regarding implementation of PBIS and the positive student behavior incentives throughout the school.

- *Discipline data
- *Positive Office Notes
- *Owl of the Month
- *Attendance

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Haberman (habermant@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Implement Positive Behavior Systems using "Camp Champs"
 Implement Positive Behavior Systems using "Positive Office Notes"
 Implement Positive Behavior using Owl of the Month aligned to Duval's Culture of Careacter
 Implement daily Calm Classroom Strategies

When implemented correctly, PBIS promotes a more positive school climate, safer learning environments, and more trusting and respectful student-teacher relationships (pbis.org). Theschool will continue to refine our PBIS systems and structures to increasestudent learning, behavior, and safety while implementing Positive Behavior incentives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the

Adding positive behavior interventions to their discipline methods and positive behavior incentives will help students in understanding and correcting their behaviors. Additionally, Calm Classroom techniques provide students with skills to self regulate which in return will create a healthier and productive learning enviornment.

resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- *PBIS Team will collaboratively revise the PBIS plan based on PBIS observation data, discipline and attendance data. The school will use school-wide rewards system to motivate students.
- * PBIS Team will review data quarterly to determine progress toward our goals.
- *The school will purchase supplies and incentives to promote positive behavior, increase student safety and overall student achievement.
- *Continue use of Calm Classroom
- *School-wide PBIS plan presented to the staff, parents, community, and students.

Person Responsible Stacy Bradley (bradleys@duvalschools.org)

RAISE

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

N/A

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

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:

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

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:

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

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Haberman, Tammy, habermant@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

N/A	Haberman, Tammy, habermant@duvalschools.org
-----	---

Positive Culture & Environment

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Our school provided a positive culture by implementing a shared vision among all stakeholders. This vision allows for all stakeholders to feel that their concerns and opinions are being heard. No decision is made in isolation and all voices are heard to come up with a vision and plan that is best for our students. The administrative team operates within the concept of an open-door policy, where in all stakeholders are encouraged to share ideas and concerns freely. Surveys such as the 5Essentials, provide feedback that helps the administrative team target areas that are related to climate and culture. The establishment of teams such as the Sunshine Committee, Shared Decision Making, PBIS and Events ensure that the voice of the school is heard based on ALL stakeholders. While these teams are internal, the School Advisory Committee helps make sure that the voices of stakeholders outside of the school setting are heard. This committee meets monthly and included individuals from various backgrounds who play a vital role in

decision-making conversations related to school improvement.

CHAMPS is a school-wide behavior plan that is implemented in all classrooms, as well as common areas within our school. Generating school and classroom expectations and leadership following through consistently with consequences creates a sense of trust and support from all stakeholders. Being able to align our classroom discipline processes, procedures and consequences with the Student Code of Conduct allows for all stakeholders to be involved which has the greatest effect on positive school culture. Recognition is one way students feel valued. Our Cafeteria has implemented "Camp CHAMPS" that aligns specifically with our CHAMPS behavior plan as well as our PBIS Plan. Students will be recognized every 10 days for following the CHAMPS expectations and Rules in the Cafeteria with a small treat and recognition on the Morning News. We also focus on a character trait each month which provides students the ability to be recognized by their teacher in front of other students, staff, and parents. The power of praise promotes an awareness that changes student behaviors and allows for others to see how this character trait aligns with our school expectations.

Our PBIS Team developed a yearly plan that allows for teachers and staff to meet monthly to go over behavior data, planning (systems), implementation (practices and training) as well as how we are going to communicate with different stakeholders. This allows for everyone to have input in where we are headed and what our celebrations are throughout the year.

Our school also partners with PTA to provide opportunities for families to become involved in their children's education through events such as:

- *PTA Skate Night
- *Fun Run Fundraiser
- *PTA Movie Night
- *Winter Food Drive Sponsored by PTA
- *Middle School Information Night
- *PTA Teacher Appreciation Week
- *Science Night
- *Family Fit Night

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

Loretto has numerous stakeholder groups that contribute to promoting a positive school and environment including PTA, SAC, faith-based partners, business partners, parents, students and faculty/staff