
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Love Grove Elementary School

2446 UNIVERSITY BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32216

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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 providing 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 and expectations, instructional goal setting, and college/career focused learning fostered by our STEAM program.

Concentration of resources 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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

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.
Caccavale, Georgia	Math Coach	Facilitates collaborative planning to help support teachers with instructional strategies and content. Pulls small groups of students to provide needed interventions based on data collected throughout the school year. Supports teachers in the classroom through modelling lessons, analyzing data, and providing resources required to teach content.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Monthly SAC meetings are held to involve a variety of stakeholders in examining aspects of the school as suggested by the priorities and generate a School Improvement Plan (SIP) that addresses the targeting of the identified priorities and meeting student performance standards. SAC members consider what is known about the school and decide which areas need improvement through an analysis of student achievement and school performance data. After the SAC decides which needs are most important and pressing, the group will then develop strategies for improving the areas most important to the school and decide how to measure the results of the strategies that will be implemented. At the end of this process and regularly throughout the school year, the SAC will have created and updated the School Improvement Plan which addresses issues relative to budget, training, instructional materials, technology, staffing, student support services, school safety, discipline strategies, student health and fitness, and matters of resource allocation. Love Grove Elementary SAC members will include members of the school leadership team, parents, teachers/staff, and business/community leaders.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Continuous monitoring of the strategies implemented in the School Improvement Plan will take place throughout the year by the school leadership team during scheduled leadership meetings (three times a month). Monitoring of SIP priorities, strategies, and student data will be embedded in weekly collaborative planning as we assess how instructional strategies developed in the SIP has an effect on student performance in mastering state benchmarks. Monthly SAC meetings will also be used to examine school data points and collect continuous input from stakeholders on the effectiveness of strategies implemented to determine if revisions need to be made to the school improvement plan.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	80%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	2	32	33	25	28	21	0	0	0	141
One or more suspensions	0	1	8	3	2	4	0	0	0	18
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	23	29	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	20	21	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	26	46	37	0	0	0	0	0	114

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	17	24	21	25	25	0	0	0	113

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	30	28	26	20	18	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	2	0	11	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	13	29	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	9	26	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	14	30	36	0	0	0	0	0	82

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	13	24	36	10	26	0	0	0	111

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	2	8	0	1	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	30	28	26	20	18	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	2	0	11	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	13	29	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	9	26	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	14	30	36	0	0	0	0	0	82

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	13	24	36	10	26	0	0	0	111

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	2	8	0	1	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	33	48	53	41	50	56	35		
ELA Learning Gains				58			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			46		
Math Achievement*	44	58	59	51	48	50	41		
Math Learning Gains				66			63		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			79		
Science Achievement*	34	52	54	40	59	59	26		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	38	54	59	58			52		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	185
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	1	
ELL	31	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	31	Yes	1	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	46			
FRL	35	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP	48			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	33			44			34					38
SWD	30			25			44				4	
ELL	23			46			17				5	38
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			45			39				4	
HSP	23			42			21				5	41
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	44			52			42				3	
FRL	33			46			32				5	31

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	41	58	64	51	66	52	40					58
SWD	33	53		36	61		31					
ELL	28	50	62	50	69	45	21					58
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	46	61		50	69		53					
HSP	28	50	54	50	72		20					60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	53	65		51	54		38					
FRL	51	66		56	70	54	41					41

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	35	47	46	41	63	79	26					52
SWD	24	26		22	61		28					20
ELL	22	31		47	77		18					52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	43		28	60		15					
HSP	25	29		48	50		33					51
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	40	60		45	75		38					
FRL	37	48	50	42	64	73	26					54

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	24%	47%	-23%	54%	-30%
04	2023 - Spring	35%	50%	-15%	58%	-23%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	25%	46%	-21%	50%	-25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	47%	59%	-12%	59%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	58%	-6%	61%	-9%
05	2023 - Spring	37%	52%	-15%	55%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	22%	48%	-26%	51%	-29%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Across all grade levels, reading showed the lowest performance (3rd:25%, 4th: 35%, and 5th: 24%). Contributing factors to our low performance were:

- Adjustment to new curriculum and benchmarks
- Less focus on small group instruction
- New teacher to ELA in 4th grade
- High number of ELL students

A trend that emerges across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas is our consistently low number 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 not accomplished last year, however, we will set goals this year to increase proficiency in reading, math, and science. Specifically, our intermediate students who are economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities (SWDs), and English Language Learners (ELLs).

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

Reading showed the greatest decline dropping 6 percentage points from the previous year. Contributing factors to our decline were:

- Adjustment to new curriculum and benchmarks
- Less focus on small group instruction

- New teacher to ELA in 4th grade
- High number of ELL students

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Science had the greatest gap as 35% of our students scored proficient compared to 50% for the state. The factors that contributed to this gap were...

- Experienced science teacher retired.
- Brand new teacher in 5th grade science beginning in October of school year.
- Inconsistent small group instruction by teacher.

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

4th grade math showed the most improvement from the previous year with a 12 percentage point increase. Actions taken that contributed to this increase were...

- intensive teacher support from Interventionist and Principal.
- Consistent small group instruction provided by teacher and interventionist.
- ELL para support.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Two potential concerns for the upcoming school year include...

1. The number of students absent 10% or more days throughout the school year.
2. The number of students with two or more early warning indicators throughout all grade levels.

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

1. ELA proficiency in grades 3-5.
2. 5th grade math proficiency and LPQ gains.
3. 5th grade science proficiency.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Standards based instructional best practices will be utilized in the classroom 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 42%. In addition, applying differentiated instructional strategies and providing small group tiered instruction based on individualized student data 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 2022-2023 school year was 35%. 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, the Assistant Principal, will be responsible for monitoring the desired outcome in Reading. This will be accomplished through frequent Benchmark Walk-Throughs with specific feedback to teachers and leading collaborative planning for all grade levels where discussions will include student data, student work, and alignment of benchmarks to daily lessons.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffanie McClain Richmond (richmond@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Several research-based Tier 1 instructional programs, as well as intervention/remediation resources, will be implemented during the 2023-2024 school year. In addition, the school will dedicate specific time in teacher schedules during the instructional school day for a remediation block (small groups). The resources/ instructional programs that will be utilized this year are as follows:

*Reading K-2: Direct Instruction using Benchmark Advance, UFLI, Waterford, iReady

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

*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 benchmarks, and analyze multiple sources of data to progress

monitor student mastery of benchmarks that will drive future instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teacher use of engagement strategies and tier 1 supports to include anchor charts and graphic organizers , facilitating student conversations and student debate, and students asking and answering clarifying questions.

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

By When: ongoing throughout the school year

Focus on classroom schedules to ensure proper instructional time for each content block.

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

By When: ongoing throughout the school year

Planned small group instruction implemented with fidelity.

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

By When: ongoing throughout the school year

Measuring Up curriculum purchased with Title 1 funds to support small group instruction.

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

By When: ongoing throughout the school year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Standards based instructional best practices will be utilized in the classroom 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 52%. In addition, applying differentiated instructional strategies and providing small group tiered instruction based on individualized student data 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 2022-2023 school year was 46%. Student Achievement Goal: Increase Math Proficiency to 52% or above.

Monitoring:

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

Ms. Caccavale, the Math Interventionist, will be responsible for monitoring the desired outcome in Math. This will be accomplished through frequent Benchmark Walk-Throughs with specific feedback to teachers (Admin. will conduct BWT's) and leading collaborative planning for all grade levels where discussions will include student data, student work, and alignment of benchmarks to daily lessons.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Several research-based Tier 1 instructional programs, as well as intervention/remediation resources, will be implemented during the 2023-2024 school year. In addition, the school will dedicate specific time in teacher schedules during the instructional school day for a remediation block (small groups). The resources/ instructional programs that will be utilized this year are as follows:

*Math K-2: Direct Instruction using FI 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 benchmarks, and analyze multiple sources of data to progress monitor student mastery of benchmarks that will drive future instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Replaced Acaletics with Manatee Math Club for math grades 3-5.

Person Responsible: Georgia Caccavale (caccavaleg@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Focus on classroom schedules to ensure proper instructional time for each content block.

Person Responsible: Georgia Caccavale (caccavaleg@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Planned small group instruction implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Georgia Caccavale (caccavaleg@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Measuring Up curriculum to support small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Georgia Caccavale (caccavaleg@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Standards based instructional best practices will be utilized in the classroom that will support student mastery of the Florida standards in Science, that will, in turn, help us reach our proficiency goal of 40%. In addition, applying differentiated instructional strategies and providing small group tiered instruction based on individualized student data 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 2022-2023 school year was 35%. Student Achievement Goal: Increase Science Proficiency to 40% or above.

Monitoring:

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

Mr. Parris, the Principal, will be responsible for monitoring the desired outcome in Science. This will be accomplished through frequent Benchmark Walk-Throughs with specific feedback to teachers and leading science collaborative planning for grades 3-5 where discussions will include student data, student work, and alignment of standards to daily lessons.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Several research-based Tier 1 instructional programs, as well as intervention/remediation resources, will be implemented during the 2023-2024 school year. In addition, the school will dedicate specific time in teacher schedules during the instructional school day for a remediation block (small groups). The resources/ instructional programs that will be utilized this year are as follows:

*Science K-2: Direct Instruction using District resources and HMH curriculum

*Math 3-5: Direct Instruction using District resources and HMH curriculum, Measure Up, Study Island, and aligned investigations

*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 science standards, and analyze multiple sources of data to progress

monitor student mastery of standards that will drive future instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Focus on hands-on aligned science investigations provided in curriculum.

Person Responsible: Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Closely monitor/incentivize Study Island usage.

Person Responsible: Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Planned small group instruction implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Measuring Up curriculum to support small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome will be a continued high rate of teacher retention, lower number of referrals written, and parent/teacher/stakeholder feedback throughout the school year.

Monitoring:

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

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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The following systems/interventions address this area of focus:

- * Collaborative Planning and Professional Learning Communities
 - * 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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All strategies listed improve the school culture to ensure a safe and positive environment conducive to learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Continue current PBIS initiatives

Person Responsible: Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Continue building relationships with faith-based and community partnerships to provide support to teachers/staff and students.

Person Responsible: Kendall Parris (parrisk@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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 42%. 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 related 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 42%. 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 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 Measurable Outcomes

42% or more of our K-2 students will be proficient on grade-level benchmarks on the State FAST assessment in 2023.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

42% or more of our 3-5 students will be proficient on grade-level benchmarks on the State FAST assessment in 2023.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

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 help facilitate our collaborative planning and are 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

Description:

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. §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 continuing to implement a fairly new program, UFLI, to remediate phonics instruction. In grades 3-5, we will begin to implement UFLI for the first time that will provide 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 curriculum Measuring Up that will provide our students in grades 3-5 small group instruction and practice with complex texts to improve reading comprehension.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based 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 comprehend 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 BWT tool to monitor/provide feedback to teachers on engaging classroom instruction, appropriate use of resources, instructional alignment to benchmarks, 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 benchmarks, implementation of best practices in the classroom, and analyzing student data to drive future instruction.	Parris, Kendall, parrisk@duvalschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan will be an agenda item in every School Advisory Council meeting throughout the school year. The SIP will also be disseminated through our school website, available to view during all school functions to include Title 1 events, and available in the parent resource room located in the front office.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

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 the ability to create lasting relationships among all stakeholders. The following systems in place at LGE address these efforts:

- *School webpage to inform parents of school initiatives and events
- *Student progress reports and report cards each quarter
- * Sunshine Committee and other Faculty & Staff Engagement events
- * 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
- *Communication system to include weekly parent newsletters, FOCUS access, parent phone calls/ emails, and Bloomz (new parent communication app)

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

At LGE, we will continually assess the academic program to strengthen areas needing improvement as reflected in student performance data. The following systems in place at LGE address these efforts:

- * Collaborative Planning and Professional Learning Communities each week
- * In-Service and Early Release Day Trainings each month
- *Instructional schedules created for each teacher
- *Teacher access to all district curriculum and resources
- *Math Interventionist to support the academic program through teacher mentoring, modelling, collaborative planning, providing instructional resources, and pulling small groups for remediation.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

n/a