

Duval County Public Schools

Love Grove 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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: 7/26/2022

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 93% |
| 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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: C (53%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (43%) |
| 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 93% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 80% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 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: The mission of Love Grove Elementary School is to prepare students for LIFE (Lead, Inspire, Focus, Excel) in every classroom, for every student, every day through a safe, inclusive, and collaborative school program.

This will be accomplished through our collective concentration on our vision 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 their knowledge

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: The vision of Love Grove Elementary School is to inspire and prepare students 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

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 |
|----------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Parris, Kendall | Principal | Monitor academic instruction and student mastery of standards, as well as foster a positive and supportive school environment that supports academic and social/emotional growth for all students. |
| McClain Richmond, Tiffanie | Assistant Principal | Monitor academic instruction and student mastery of standards, as well as foster a positive and supportive school environment that supports academic and social/emotional growth for all students. |
| Duffy, Jill | Other | Monitor academic instruction and student mastery of standards in the SLA and PI program, as well as foster a positive and supportive school environment that supports academic and social/emotional growth for all students. |
| Fuller, Nicole | Other | Supports groups of students using interventions approved by the District to increase student achievement. |
| Caccavale, Georgia | Other | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/26/2022, Kendall Parris

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.*

0

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

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

342

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

6

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

5

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 | 53 | 73 | 55 | 61 | 49 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 349 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 30 | 28 | 26 | 20 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 2 | 14 | 30 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 |

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 | 2 | 13 | 24 | 36 | 10 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/26/2022

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 | 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 |

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 | 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 |

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 | 41% | 50% | 56% | | | | 40% | 50% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 58% | | | | | | 55% | 56% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 64% | | | | | | 54% | 50% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 51% | 48% | 50% | | | | 47% | 62% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 66% | | | | | | 50% | 63% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 52% | | | | | | 46% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 40% | 59% | 59% | | | | 44% | 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 | 24% | 51% | -27% | 58% | -34% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 42% | 52% | -10% | 58% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -24% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 25% | 50% | -25% | 56% | -31% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -42% | | | | |

| 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 | 52% | 61% | -9% | 62% | -10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 64% | -9% | 64% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 25% | 57% | -32% | 60% | -35% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -55% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 49% | -14% | 53% | -18% |
| 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 | 33 | 53 | | 36 | 61 | | 31 | | | | |
| ELL | 28 | 50 | 62 | 50 | 69 | 45 | 21 | | | | |
| BLK | 46 | 61 | | 50 | 69 | | 53 | | | | |
| HSP | 28 | 50 | 54 | 50 | 72 | | 20 | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | 65 | | 51 | 54 | | 38 | | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 66 | | 56 | 70 | 54 | 41 | | | | |

| 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 | | | | |
| HSP | 31 | 50 | 46 | 50 | 58 | 36 | 44 | | | | |
| WHT | 39 | 55 | 54 | 57 | 54 | | 31 | | | | |
| FRL | 37 | 52 | 50 | 50 | 54 | 50 | 42 | | | | |

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 | 54 |
| 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 | 58 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 430 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 43 |
| 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 | 48 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 56 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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?

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 in the past for Love Grove has been to increase Reading, Math and Science proficiency to 50% or above. This was accomplished last year in Math with 51% proficient, however, we will set goals this year to increase proficiency in reading and science as well. 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 2022 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:

- *Student attendance and mobility
- *A need for consistent small-group instruction in reading
- *The need for professional development in the area of ESOL instructional strategies

Action Steps:

- *All teachers fully immersed in Standards-Aligned instructional practices
- *Addressing student attendance and mobility concerns
- *More professional development in the area of ESOL instructional strategies

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

The most improvement we saw in 2022 was 5th grade science proficiency. Proficiency on the state assessment increased from 26% in 2021 to 40% in 2022.

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

Our improvement in science proficiency can be attributed to our use of District created PPTS that aligned to the standards and intensive district specialist support all school year.

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 create partnerships to accelerate learning.
- *Administration will provide relevant standards-aligned professional development.
- *Teachers and Interventionists will deliver standards-aligned, rigorous, grade-level appropriate instruction (B.E.S.T Standards).
- *Teachers and Interventionists will differentiate instruction and provide adequately aligned lessons/tasks to bridge learning gaps.
- *Teachers and Interventionists will implement instructional interventions and supplements such as Reading Mastery, 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 BEST standards and aligned Instruction, as well as best teaching practices.
- *Early Release Day trainings with choice options for professional development in Reading, Math, and Science.
- *Teacher Planning and Grade Level collaboration.
- *Continual progress monitoring training using Performance Matters and FOCUS.
- *Full Implementation of Multi-Tiered Support Services (MTSS).

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 feedback using the SWT tool.
- *Increased progress monitoring of student achievement.
- *Retaining current instructional staff in an appropriate grade level fit.
- *Create a positive school culture for all stakeholders.

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 ELA**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Standards based instructional best practices will be utilized that will support student mastery of the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards in Reading, that will, in turn, help us reach our proficiency goal of 50%. In addition, applying differentiated instructional strategies will address deficit standards and will allow students to perform at independent instructional levels while working toward grade level expectations.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

Reading Proficiency for the 2021-2022 school year was 41%. Student Achievement Goal: Increase Reading Proficiency to 50% or above.

Monitoring:

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

Ms. Richmond, AP, and Nicole Fuller, Reading Interventionist, will be responsible for monitoring the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffanie McClain Richmond (richmond@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Several research-based Tier 1 instructional programs, as well as intervention/remediation resources, will be implemented during the 2022-2023 school year. In addition, the school will dedicate specific time during the instructional school day for a specific remediation block. The resources/ instructional programs that will be utilized this year are as follows:

*Reading K-2: Direct Instruction using Benchmark Advance, Reading Mastery Signature Edition (RMSE), Waterford, iReady

*Reading 3-5: Direct Instruction using Benchmark Advance, Measure Up, Freckle, Achieve 3000

*Exceptional Student Education: Unique Learning System (ULS)

The school leadership team will also monitor Tier 1 instructional best practices implemented in the classroom as well as small-group intervention/remediation lessons, facilitate collaborative planning to help plan effective instruction aligned to the Florida BEST standards, and analyze multiple sources of data to progress monitor student mastery of standards that will drive future instruction.

Rationale for**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

School leadership must ensure that students are engaged in rigorous, content-rich English Language Arts curriculum and that teachers are using best instructional practices when implementing Tier 1 and small-group remedial instruction. Providing instruction using research-based curriculum aligned to standards, coupled with the implementation of best instructional practices, will lead to increased student mastery of grade-level concepts.

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.

Use the SWT tool to monitor/provide feedback to teachers on engaging classroom instruction, appropriate use of resources, instructional alignment to standards, implementation of best practices, and aligned student work.

Person Responsible Tiffanie McClain Richmond (richmond@duvalschools.org)

Conduct weekly collaborative planning sessions that will support teachers with the use of curriculum/resources, understanding Florida BEST standards, implementation of best practices in the classroom, and analyzing student data to drive future instruction.

Person Responsible Nicole Fuller (dickinson@duvalschools.org)

Title 1 funds will be used to fund our Reading Interventionist who will provide support to our new teachers through modelling and continual feedback. She will work with all teachers to provide resources and materials to support the curriculum and classroom instruction.

Person Responsible Nicole Fuller (dickinson@duvalschools.org)

Title 1 funds will be used to fund our 5th grade reading teacher, Ms. Longo, who will provide support to our 5th grade students. The teacher will provide instruction in reading using district curriculum and resources to provide students the opportunity to master state benchmarks.

Person Responsible Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

Title 1 funds will be used to purchase the following items to support math instruction:

Storeroom Order-to purchase various classroom supplies that will support instruction and provide resources to students.

Lakeshore Learning-to purchase various learning games and manipulatives for students to use during instruction and centers.

Reach Technologies-to purchase headphones for use with district blended learning and state assessments.

Dowling Douglas-to purchase a poster maker and ink/paper supplies to print anchor charts to support classroom instruction.

Reach Technologies- to purchase 7" tablets for students to access blended learning during centers.

OPD Kids Content Area Picture Dictionaries-to provide our ESOL students a resource to use for vocabulary acquisition.

Person Responsible Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Standards based instructional best practices will be utilized that will support student mastery of the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards in Math, that will, in turn, help us reach our proficiency goal of 60%. In addition, applying differentiated instructional strategies will address deficit standards and will allow students to perform at independent instructional levels while working toward grade level expectations.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Math Proficiency for the 2021-2022 school year was 51%. Student Achievement Goal: Increase Math Proficiency to 60% or above.

Monitoring:

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

Mr. Parris, Principal, and Georgia Caccavale, Math Interventionist, will be responsible for monitoring the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Several research-based Tier 1 instructional programs, as well as intervention/remediation resources, will be implemented during the 2022-2023 school year. In addition, the school will dedicate specific time during the instructional school day for a specific remediation block. The resources/ instructional programs that will be utilized this year are as follows:

*Math K-2: Direct Instruction using FL Reveal Math, Waterford, iReady

*Math 3-5: Direct Instruction using FL Reveal Math, Measure Up, Freckle

*Exceptional Student Education: Unique Learning System (ULS)

The school leadership team will also monitor Tier 1 instructional best practices implemented in the classroom as well as small-group intervention/remediation lessons, facilitate collaborative planning to help plan effective instruction aligned to the Florida BEST standards, and analyze multiple sources of data to progress monitor student mastery of standards that will drive future instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

School leadership must ensure that students are engaged in rigorous, content-rich Math curriculum and that teachers are using best instructional practices when implementing Tier 1 and small-group remedial instruction. Providing instruction using research-based curriculum aligned to standards, coupled with the implementation of best instructional practices, will lead to increased student mastery of grade-level concepts.

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.

Use the SWT tool to monitor/provide feedback to teachers on engaging classroom instruction, appropriate use of resources, instructional alignment to standards, implementation of best practices, and aligned student work.

Person Responsible Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

Conduct weekly collaborative planning sessions that will support teachers with the use of curriculum/resources, understanding Florida BEST standards, implementation of best practices in the classroom, and analyzing student data to drive future instruction.

Person Responsible Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

Title 1 funds will be used to fund our Math Interventionist who will provide support to our new teachers through modelling and continual feedback. She will work with all teachers to provide resources and materials to support the curriculum and classroom instruction.

Person Responsible Georgia Caccavale (caccavaleg@duvalschools.org)

Title 1 funds will be used to purchase the following items to support math instruction:

IXL Learning-compute software program designed to improve student math skills.

Storeroom Order-to purchase various classroom supplies that will support instruction and provide resources to students.

Lakeshore Learning-to purchase various learning games and manipulatives for students to use during instruction and centers.

Acaletics-Instructional program used to help students master state benchmarks used on a daily basis for practice.

Reach Technologies-to purchase headphones for use with district blended learning and state assessments.

Dowling Douglas-to purchase a poster maker and ink/paper supplies to print anchor charts to support classroom instruction.

Reach Technologies- to purchase 7" tablets for students to access blended learning during centers.

Person Responsible Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Standards based instructional best practices will be utilized that will support student mastery of the Florida standards in Science, that will, in turn, help us reach our proficiency goal of 50%. In addition, applying differentiated instructional strategies will address deficit standards and will allow students to perform at independent instructional levels while working toward grade level expectations.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Science Proficiency for the 2021-2022 school year was 40%. Student Achievement Goal: Increase Science Proficiency to 50% or above.

Monitoring:

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

Mr. Parris, Principal, and Georgia Caccavale, Math Interventionist, will be responsible for monitoring the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Several research-based Tier 1 instructional programs, as well as intervention/remediation resources, will be implemented during the 2022-2023 school year. In addition, the school will dedicate specific time during the instructional school day for a specific remediation block. The resources/ instructional programs that will be utilized this year are as follows:

*Science K-2: Direct Instruction using curriculum lesson guides, aligned investigations

*Math 3-5: Direct Instruction using HMH, curriculum lesson guides, aligned investigations, GIZMO, Study Island

*Exceptional Student Education: Unique Learning System (ULS)

The school leadership team will also monitor Tier 1 instructional best practices implemented in the classroom as well as small-group intervention/remediation lessons, facilitate collaborative planning to help plan effective instruction aligned to the Florida standards, and analyze multiple sources of data to progress monitor student mastery of standards that will drive future instruction.

Rationale for**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

School leadership must ensure that students are engaged in rigorous, content-rich Science curriculum and that teachers are using best instructional practices when implementing Tier 1 and small-group remedial instruction. Providing instruction using research-based curriculum aligned to standards, coupled with the implementation of best instructional practices, will lead to increased student mastery of grade-level concepts.

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.

Use the SWT tool to monitor/provide feedback to teachers on engaging classroom instruction, appropriate use of resources, instructional alignment to standards, implementation of best practices, and aligned student work.

Person Responsible Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

Conduct weekly collaborative planning sessions that will support teachers with the use of curriculum/resources, understanding Florida standards, implementation of best practices in the classroom, and analyzing student data to drive future instruction.

Person Responsible Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

Title 1 funds will be used to purchase the following items to support math instruction:

Storeroom Order-to purchase various classroom supplies that will support instruction and provide resources to students.

Lakeshore Learning-to purchase various learning games and manipulatives for students to use during instruction and centers.

Reach Technologies-to purchase headphones for use with district blended learning and state assessments.

Dowling Douglas-to purchase a poster maker and ink/paper supplies to print anchor charts to support classroom instruction.

Reach Technologies- to purchase 7" tablets for students to access blended learning during centers.

Scholastic News-to purchase science magazines to supplement district curriculum and provide another resource for science information.

Person Responsible Kendall Parris (parrisk@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

We will implement standards based instructional best practices that will support student mastery of the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards in Reading, that will, in turn, help us reach our proficiency goal of 50%. In addition, implementing differentiated instructional strategies and research-based resources will address deficit standards and will allow students to perform at independent instructional levels while working toward grade level expectations.

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

We will implement standards based instructional best practices that will support student mastery of the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards in Reading, that will, in turn, help us reach our proficiency goal of 50%. In addition, implementing differentiated instructional strategies and research-based resources will address deficit standards and will allow students to perform at independent instructional levels while working toward grade level expectations.

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)

50% or more of our K-2 students will be proficient on grade-level benchmarks on the State FAST assessment in 2023.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

50% or more of our 3-5 students will be proficient on grade-level benchmarks on the State FAST assessment in 2023.

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.

The area of focus will be monitored in multiple ways. First, we will conduct collaborative planning each week with our grade-level ELA teachers to discuss current lessons, expectations, and student work aligned to the benchmarks. Second, we will have district support through Specialists who conduct our collaborative planning and available to model, co-teach, and provide feedback in the classroom. Finally, Administration will conduct benchmark walk-throughs each week to monitor instructional strategies and classroom practices and their alignment to the state benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Parris, Kendall, parrisk@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?

We will be implementing evidenced-based practices/programs this school year to achieve our measurable outcomes in reading for all grade levels. In k-2, we will be implementing a new program, UFLI, to remediate phonics instruction. In grades 3-5, we will continue implementing Corrective Reading that provides intensive direct instruction-based reading intervention for students who are reading below grade level. This Direct Instruction reading intervention program delivers tightly sequenced, carefully planned lessons that give struggling students the structure and practice necessary to become skilled, fluent readers and better learners. This year, we are also purchasing the program Act Now! that will give our students in grades 3-5 instruction and practice with complex texts and reading comprehension.

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?

Many of our students, even in our upper grades, struggle with phonics and vocabulary. The programs mentioned above will provide the direct-instruction needed to close this gap and provide our students with the foundations necessary to begin comprehending text.

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 |
|---|--|
| Use the SWT tool to monitor/provide feedback to teachers on engaging classroom instruction, appropriate use of resources, instructional alignment to standards, implementation of best practices, and aligned student work. | Parris, Kendall, parrisk@duvalschools.org |
| Conduct weekly collaborative planning sessions that will support teachers with the use of curriculum/resources, understanding Florida standards, implementation of best practices in the classroom, and analyzing student data to drive future instruction. | Parris, Kendall, parrisk@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.

At Love Grove Elementary, we realize that a positive school culture is dependent upon high levels of support from administration, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are confident in their roles and relationships with students and staff, and stakeholders that value 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
- * School-wide PBIS initiatives to include positive behavior referrals, Magnificent Manatees, and a school store
- Parent Liaison to reach out to families to encourage parental involvement

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

Kendall Parris, Principal-Ensuring all initiatives are carried out.

Tiffanie Richmond, Assistant Principal-Ensuring all initiatives are carried out, creates and monitors all positive school incentives.

Esther Greene, School Counselor-Creates and monitors positive school incentives such as Magnificent Manatee and the School Store.

Marisol Chang, Parent Liaison-Serves as our school representative to bridge the gap between school and families to increase communication, parental involvement, school partnerships in the community, and PTA membership.