
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	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Loretto Elementary School

3900 LORETTO RD, Jacksonville, FL 32223

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

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.

Loretto Elementary School as part of the Duval County Public Schools is committed to providing differentiated, standards-based instruction that will allow all students to achieve their goals and use their knowledge to be successful in a culturally diverse and technologically-advanced world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Loretto Elementary the school, home and community will work together to provide a safe and successful academic environment, which is committed to assisting in development of each student while exploring the social and technological world around them.

School Leadership Team, 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
Haberman, Tammy	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity, manages school schedules to use support staff effectively, ensures that the shared decision making process is used effectively, communicates with parents in order to gain a partnership between school and home.
Bradley, Stacy	Assistant Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity, manages school schedules to use support staff effectively, ensures that the shared decision making process is used effectively, communicates with parents in order to gain a partnership between school and home.
Vondrasek, Lee Ann	Teacher, K-12	Provides academic instruction in every content area; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention. Provides a safe and academic rich learning environment for every student, every day. Grade level leader providing support through modeling and implementation of Benchmark lessons, Blended Learning, and data driven centers
Graves, Brianne	Behavior Specialist	CSS Site Coach for 8 self-contained class providing K-5 academic support; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention. Provides assistance to teachers through modeling and implementation of lessons, IEP Goals, and behavior support

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.

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 SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. Our School Advisory Council meets to determine schoolwide goals and objectives based on our school data.

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))

Every month, the SIP is reviewed using current data to continually update, refining and use the plan throughout the school year. Mid-Year Assessment is conducted using a progress monitoring questions to ensure our goals continue to align and growth is occurring for all students.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	39%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	40%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	0	32	23	27	23	28	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	10	0	2	4	1	2	0	0	0	19
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	10	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	10	2	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	13	17	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	22	15	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	36	43	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	10	13	29	43	13	14	0	0	0	122

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	10	4	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	32	23	27	23	28	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	4	1	2	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	1	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	1	2	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	13	17	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	22	15	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	36	43	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	1	13	29	43	13	14	0	0	0	113

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	1	9	0	1	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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	32	23	27	23	28	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	4	1	2	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	1	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	1	2	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	13	17	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	22	15	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	36	43	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	1	13	29	43	13	14	0	0	0	113

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	1	9	0	1	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	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*	63	48	53	70	50	56	69		
ELA Learning Gains				70			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			39		
Math Achievement*	65	58	59	74	48	50	72		
Math Learning Gains				66			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			35		
Science Achievement*	62	52	54	59	59	59	68		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	48	54	59	83			65		

* 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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	300
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66

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	529
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	27	Yes	1	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	51			
HSP	47			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	42			

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	42			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	62			
HSP	55			

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	61			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	58			

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	63			65			62					48
SWD	27			22			27				4	
ELL	39			46			31				5	48
AMI												
ASN	81			93			90				4	
BLK	45			45			62				3	
HSP	48			44			50				5	50
MUL	57			70							3	
PAC												
WHT	67			67			64				4	
FRL	43			41			41				4	

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	70	70	47	74	66	60	59					83
SWD	29	45	41	42	59	50	26					
ELL	46	52		69	82							83
AMI												
ASN	91	86		100	95		90					

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	60	64		60	68	60	62					
HSP	57	54	40	65	57	46	41					80
MUL	68			53								
PAC												
WHT	72	72	49	76	65	62	61					
FRL	52	65	48	57	64	69	53					

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	69	58	39	72	50	35	68					65
SWD	29	16	13	48	24	29	24					
ELL	58			68								65
AMI												
ASN	85	77		94	71		92					
BLK	60	50		55	38		50					
HSP	56	61		64	44		53					67
MUL	55			55								
PAC												
WHT	73	56	33	75	49	41	72					
FRL	58	48	33	58	39	47	56					

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	47%	14%	54%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	50%	23%	58%	15%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	61%	46%	15%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	73%	59%	14%	59%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	58%	12%	61%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	52%	5%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	48%	13%	51%	10%

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.

Based off the prior years data, both Reading and Math Proficiency dropped in 3rd Grade Reading (-6%), 4th Grade Reading (-2%), 5th Grade Reading (-7%), 4th Grade Math (-16%), and 5th Grade Math (-9%). Based on the data, our school had a high number of students who started proficient in Reading, however, the percentage of students moving from not proficient to proficient by the end of the year was 21% in 3-5 ELA. The percentage of students moving from not proficient to proficient by the end of the year in Math was significantly higher at 47%. The contributing factor to the low performance and need for improvement was being able to differentiate tasks for students that align with the states benchmarks and address each students individual needs.

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

Based off the prior year data, both Reading and Math Proficiency are an area that demonstrated the greatest need for improvement. The contributing factor to the low performance and need for improvement align specifically with the focus being able to differentiate tasks that align with the benchmark and address each students individual needs.

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.

Based off our data, 4th Grade Reading has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state's average for Reading Proficiency is 58% and our school's is 73%, making it 15% higher than the state. The contributing factor to the low performance and need for improvement align specifically with the focus being able to differentiate tasks that align with the benchmark and address each students individual needs.

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

Based on our data, 3rd Grade Math showed the most improvement within our school improving from 70% proficiency to 73% proficiency. The actions that were taken to show improvement in this area were continued quarterly data chats and progress monitoring to help identify interventions that were working and areas/benchmarks that needed improvement, strategic planning during PLCS, peer observations to ensure that teachers were provided with support based on the specific needs of the classrooms.

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

Based on the EWS data from Part 1, one potential area of concern would be students with attendance below 90 percent. Students who attend school regularly have been shown to achieve at higher levels than students who do not have regular attendance. This relationship starts early in a child's school career. If Loretto can address the attendance concerns then it can increase student engagement and achievement in both Reading and Math.

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

Our highest priorities for the upcoming school year will be the following:

- Utilize weekly PLCS to align student tasks with the benchmark and address each students needs individually
- Focus on differentiated small group instruction using current data addressing all students
- Use weekly PLCS and Early Release Professional Development to work with teachers on curriculum development with imbedded peer observations.
- Quarterly data chats and progress monitoring to help identify interventions that are working and areas of improvement.
- Consistent and immediate feedback regarding class visits and instruction during centers.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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.

As a school, we will work to improve our overall perspective on school-wide behavior, safety and positive intervention and supports. Utilizing the 5 Essentials teacher and Student survey Data, our lowest performing measure for teachers was, Collective Responsibility at 37. Where as our lowest performing measure for students was, Safety at 19. Teacher leaders will work together to develop a stronger culture and climate that allows teachers to collaborate with their grade level and school wide to improve student behavior and school safety within the schools approach to PBIS.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If teachers are provided with school-wide behavior, and positive interventions and supports through the PBIS model, we will see an increase in developing a stronger climate and culture that allows for students to feel safe and teachers to help maintain discipline in the entire school, not just in their classroom .

Monitoring:

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

Faculty and Staff monthly conversations will be used to guide discussions regarding implementation of PBIS and the positive student behavior incentives throughout the school. Data points that will be monitored will be the following:

- Discipline Data
- Positive Office Notes
- Attendance
- Bloomz
- Owl of the Month

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Haberman (habermant@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.)

- Implement Positive Behavior Systems in Lunch Room
- Implement Positive Behavior Systems using "Positive Office Notes"
- Implement Positive Behavior Systems using Owl of the Month aligned to Duval's Culture of Careacter
- Implement Bloomz
- Implement daily Calm Classroom Strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the center on PBIS, PBIS Increases Student Engagement and Instructional Time Establishing school-wide expectations with your students sets the tone for the classroom. When you spend time getting to know your students and use strategies to deepen connections every day, you are building a healthy classroom environment. When students have clear expectations, are regularly acknowledged for the things they do well, and receive instructional consequences more often than exclusionary ones, they are going to spend more time in class than out of it. Not only that, when schools implement PBIS, students are more engaged in instruction. This in return will also help address our ELA and Math goals as a school.

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.

PBIS Team will meet monthly to review and revise current PBIS Plan based on previous years discipline, attendance and 5 Essentials Survey Data.

Person Responsible: Stacy Bradley (bradleys@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

PBIS Team will review data quarterly to determine progress towards the schools goal.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: May 31, 2024

The school will purchase supplies and incentives to promote positive behavior, increase student safety and overall student achievement.

Person Responsible: Stacy Bradley (bradleys@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

School-Wide PBIS Plan will be presented to all stakeholders of Loretto Elementary School.

Person Responsible: Stacy Bradley (bradleys@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

#2. 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.

Based on our 2023 FAST data, only 65% of our students in grades 3rd-5th made earned proficient score in Reading. We will focus school wide with aligned instruction and student tasks based on state Benchmarks. Through full implementation of data-driven whole group lessons related to student performance in reading.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of LES teachers will engage in data-driven benchmark whole group lessons with clearly articulated learning intentions, data chats with individual students, and analyze student work during common planning. Through this work, student proficiency in reading will increase from 65% to 72%.

Monitoring:

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

Implementation of the effectiveness of whole group instruction aligning with the state benchmarks will be monitored by admin conducting weekly walkthroughs, monitoring data (school and district), quarterly teacher data chats, and providing teachers with specific and immediate feedback in order to support teachers with their whole group reading instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Haberman (habermant@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.)

Professional development will be provided for teachers focusing on data-driven benchmark whole group lessons and how to analyze student data. Weekly common planning will occur K-5th grade for ELA to align data-driven benchmark aligned whole group lessons, student led learning, and differentiated task. Frequent classroom walkthroughs will occur to assess the implementation, quality and fidelity of data-driven benchmark whole group, aligned tasks, and student choices based on student data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Visible Learning for Literacy, teacher clarity effect is .75. Focusing on deep understanding of the learning intentions, relevance, and success will increase student achievement, therefore, increase student proficient in reading.

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.

Organize a content area common planning agenda providing teachers professional development regarding clearly articulating learning intentions, deep understanding of the benchmarks, student tasks, and formative assessments that aligning with grade level benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Tammy Haberman (habermant@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly meetings ending May 31, 2024

Principal and Assistant Principals will conduct weekly classroom observations whole group instruction including articulating learning intentions, relevance and success criteria and providing specific feedback to increase the quality and fidelity of the whole group lesson.

Person Responsible: Tammy Haberman (habermant@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly assigned classroom walk-through until May 31, 2024

#3. 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.

Based on our 2023 FAST data, only 67% of our students in grades 3rd-5th made earned proficient score in Math. We will focus school wide with aligned instruction and student tasks based on state Benchmarks. Through full implementation of data-driven whole group and small group lessons related to student performance in math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of LES teachers will engage in data-driven benchmark whole and small group lessons, data chats with individual students, and analyze student work during common planning. Through this work, student proficiency in math will increase from 67% to 74%.

Monitoring:

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

Implementation of the effectiveness of whole and small group instruction aligning with the state benchmarks will be monitored by admin conducting weekly walkthroughs, monitoring data (school and district), quarterly teacher data chats, and providing teachers with specific and immediate feedback in order to support teachers with their math instruction.

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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

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

Monitoring:

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

Implementation of the effectiveness of small group instruction and teacher-led instruction using district approved supplement materials will be monitored by admin conducting weekly walkthroughs, monitoring LPQ student data, Quarterly Data Chats, and providing teachers with specific and immediate feedback relating to LPQ student data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Haberman (habermant@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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus