

Duval County Public Schools

# Sabal Palm Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>17</b> |

# Sabal Palm Elementary School

1201 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Amber Felts**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 59%   |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (67%)<br>2017-18: B (60%)<br>2016-17: A (67%)<br>2015-16: A (65%)<br>2014-15: A (72%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> . |     |

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>17</b> |

# Sabal Palm Elementary School

1201 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

## School Demographics

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School<br/>KG-5</p> | <p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p> | <p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>42%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>              | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>         | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>45%</p>               |

## School Grades History

|              |                |                |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>2018-19</b> | <b>2017-18</b> | <b>2016-17</b> | <b>2015-16</b> |
| <b>Grade</b> | A              | B              | A              | A              |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

Sabal Palm is a friendly, school-based community, where we foster positive relationships and provide educational excellence for the whole child in a productive and safe learning environment for every classroom, every student, every day.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Sabal Palm's vision is to inspire and prepare students for success at every level: elementary, middle, high school, college or a career, and life.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name  | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|---|---------------------|---|
| Graham, Linda                                 | Principal           | Lead and supervise the work of the instructional programs in a safe and productive learning environment, where all students and employees are valued respected. |
| Jones, Georgette                              | Assistant Principal | Assist with monitoring and supervising the implementation of the instructional program and safety of students.  |
| Jacob, Sonya                                  | Assistant Principal | Assist with monitoring and supervising the implementation of the instructional program and safety of students.  |
| Malewicki, Christine                          | School Counselor    | Serves as the LEA Designee for the Exceptional Student Program  |
| Mondestin-hillamng@duvalschools.org, Georgine | School Counselor    | Serves as guidance support for students who have experienced traumatic situations: emotional instability, divorce, death of a parent, self-harm, etc.           |
| Gualano, Leonore                              | Teacher, K-12       | serves as the math lead teacher   |
| Kumer, Christine                              | Teacher, K-12       | Serves as the Professional Development Facilitator and contact for new teachers   |
| Nichols, Victoria                             | Teacher, K-12       | serves as the reading lead teacher  |
| Bell, Sherrie                                 | Teacher, K-12       | serves as the general education reading teacher for students with disabilities  |

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |     |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|                                 | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Number of students enrolled     | 136         | 142 | 135 | 167 | 160 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 904 |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 25          | 15  | 18  | 23  | 16  | 17  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 114 |
| One or more suspensions         | 2           | 2   | 3   | 2   | 5   | 8   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 22  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 3           | 2   | 2   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 7   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 6           | 38  | 51  | 67  | 53  | 61  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 276 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |     |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|                                      | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 6           | 15 | 30 | 35 | 27 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 149 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |    |    |    |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |     |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|                                     | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 39          | 30 | 25 | 64 | 33  | 14  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 205 |
| Students retained two or more times | 75          | 80 | 98 | 93 | 121 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 593 |

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

68

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 7/25/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Attendance below 90 percent     |             |       |
| One or more suspensions         |             |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   |             |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment |             |       |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators |             |       |

**Prior Year - Updated**



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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |     |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 31          | 26 | 22 | 28 | 32 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 159 |
| One or more suspensions         | 4           | 1  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 23  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 9           | 5  | 2  | 1  | 3  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 20  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 7           | 24 | 33 | 59 | 52 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 251 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 3 | 12 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 81 |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 72%    | 50%      | 57%   | 67%    | 49%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 64%    | 56%      | 58%   | 64%    | 56%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 55%    | 50%      | 53%   | 57%    | 54%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 80%    | 62%      | 63%   | 76%    | 62%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 69%    | 63%      | 62%   | 75%    | 63%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 55%    | 52%      | 51%   | 58%    | 54%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 75%    | 48%      | 53%   | 72%    | 50%      | 51%   |

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         |         |         |         | Total   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1       | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       |         |
| Number of students enrolled     | 136 (0)                           | 142 (0) | 135 (0) | 167 (0) | 160 (0) | 164 (0) | 904 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 25 ( )                            | 15 ( )  | 18 ( )  | 23 ( )  | 16 ( )  | 17 ( )  | 114 (0) |
| One or more suspensions         | 2 ( )                             | 2 (0)   | 3 (0)   | 2 (0)   | 5 (0)   | 8 (0)   | 22 (0)  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 3 ( )                             | 2 (0)   | 2 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 7 (0)   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 6 ( )                             | 38 (0)  | 51 (0)  | 67 (0)  | 53 (0)  | 61 (0)  | 276 (0) |

**Grade Level Data**

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

NOTE: 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 |
| 03                    | 2019 | 72%    | 51%      | 21%                        | 58%   | 14%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 68%    | 50%      | 18%                        | 57%   | 11%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 73%    | 52%      | 21%                        | 58%   | 15%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 61%    | 49%      | 12%                        | 56%   | 5%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 12%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 68%    | 50%      | 18%                        | 56%   | 12%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 54%    | 51%      | 3%                         | 55%   | -1%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 14%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 73%    | 61%      | 12%                        | 62%   | 11%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 74%    | 59%      | 15%                        | 62%   | 12%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 82%    | 64%      | 18%                        | 64%   | 18%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 80%    | 60%      | 20%                        | 62%   | 18%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 8%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 76%    | 57%      | 19%                        | 60%   | 16%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 77%    | 61%      | 16%                        | 61%   | 16%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -4%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 76%    | 49%      | 27%                        | 53%   | 23%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 65%    | 56%      | 9%                         | 55%   | 10%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

**Subgroup Data**

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |               |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 41       | 46     | 41          | 59        | 60      | 52           | 33       |         |           |                   |               |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| ELL                                       | 41       | 54     |             | 73        | 46      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 88       | 82     |             | 94        | 73      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 51       | 47     | 43          | 60        | 54      | 41           | 53       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 76       | 65     | 57          | 84        | 63      | 58           | 77       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 77       | 69     |             | 84        | 77      |              | 64       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 77       | 68     | 61          | 84        | 76      | 68           | 88       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 60       | 55     | 43          | 72        | 64      | 50           | 65       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 42       | 40     | 23          | 52        | 62      | 56           | 57       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 47       | 50     |             | 60        | 58      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 76       | 50     |             | 94        | 70      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 42       | 32     | 23          | 69        | 73      | 60           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 63       | 42     |             | 70        | 68      | 67           | 71       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 64       | 48     |             | 80        | 74      |              | 86       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 72       | 54     | 34          | 85        | 76      | 66           | 75       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 56       | 43     | 23          | 72        | 69      | 60           | 57       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD                                       | 30       | 42     | 41          | 43        | 62      | 43           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 64       | 60     |             | 79        | 90      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 71       | 58     |             | 82        | 85      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 47       | 51     | 34          | 57        | 57      | 44           | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 67       | 63     |             | 71        | 70      |              | 73       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 73       | 64     |             | 85        | 92      |              | 92       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 73       | 68     | 74          | 83        | 80      | 73           | 79       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 56       | 55     | 49          | 67        | 67      | 49           | 61       |         |           |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 65  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 53  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 523 |

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>  |      |
|--|------|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 8    |
| Percent Tested   | 100% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>   |      |
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 47   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      |      |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 53   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |      |
| <b>Native American Students</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |      |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        |      |
| <b>Asian Students</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 84   |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |      |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |      |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 50   |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |      |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |      |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 69   |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |      |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 74   |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO   |

| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                |     |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 75  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 58  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

**Analysis**

**Data Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 on the 2019 FSA Math data, students in grades 4-5 demonstrated a decrease in learning gains in math. The overall math learning gains went from 73% last year, to 69% this year. In addition, the lowest performing quartile students demonstrated a decrease in learning gains from 61% last year to 55% this year.

There is a need for consistent differentiated instruction based on formative and summative assessment data to maximize student achievement.

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

Based on the 2019 FSA Math data, students in grades 4-5 demonstrated the greatest decline from the prior year in learning gains. Contributing factors include instruction rendered by a long-term substitute teacher from February 11, 2019 to April 22, 2019. Another contributing factor was skillfully teaching to the complexity of the Florida standards. Our final contributing factor was implementing rigorous instruction to improve the performance of students in the lowest quartile and increase learning gains on the FSA for math.

**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.**

Sabal Palm data components are above the state average.

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

Based on the 2019 FSA Ela data, grades 3-5 students in the lowest performing quartile demonstrated the most improvement, with an increase in learning gains from 27% last year to 55% this year. We continued to ensure student-centered schedules that provides 90 minutes of uninterrupted blocks of reading to all students. Also, ensured VE teachers pushed in where all students receive core instruction and intervention and or enrichment within the classroom setting. In addition, this year we focused on a deeper understanding of standard-based instruction, i.e priority standards and how/ when to combine standards for a greater impact.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

One area of most concern on the EWS data would be attendance. There are a number of excessive tardies, early check-out, and absences. We will brainstorm ideas to increase student attendance.

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

1. Teachers will fully and skillfully implement standard-based instruction
2. Provide differentiated data-based instruction
3. Utilize formative data to monitor student progress and adjust instruction
4. Utilize common assessment data to identify students that require additional instruction
5. Teachers will utilize effective lessons aligned to standards to meet student needs

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>#1</b>   |  |
| <b>Title</b>  | Math Lowest Performing Quartile  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Last school year, students in the lowest 25% percentile did not meet the expected learning gains on the math FSA. Student learning gains will increase with targeted interventions implemented by teachers, VE support facilitators, and administrators.   |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Learning gains will increase from 55% to 65% on the 2020 math FSA.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Georgette Jones (jonesg1@duvalschools.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Math Reasoning<br>Math Fluency   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Reasoning - Teachers need an instructional strategy to encourage students to be more savvy interpreters of graphics in applied math problems. One idea is to have them apply a reading comprehension (word problems) strategy, Question-Answer Relationships (QARs) as a tool for analyzing math graphic<br>•Fluency - To Promote Mastery of Math Facts Through Incremental Rehearsal  |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Using common assessment and i-Ready data, teachers will plan and provide targeted small group instruction for all students.</li> <li>2. Using the MTSS Model, additional support for Tier 3 students will be provided by teacher at least 3 times per week</li> <li>3. Teachers will create differentiated centers to address the varying levels of students' academic needs.</li> <li>4. Students will be provided an opportunity to attend before or after school tutoring (at least twice a week) for remediation and enrichment of math standards.</li> <li>5. During common planning, we will use the Equip Rubric to calibrate and ensure student work meets the complexity of the standards.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Georgette Jones (jonesg1@duvalschools.org)   |

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| <b>#2</b>        |  |
| <b>Title</b>     | Reading Lowest Performing Quartile   |
| <b>Rationale</b> | Continue building on the work put forth by teachers and students, , we will implement a common approach to literacy. The goal is to decrease the deficiencies in our data by providing teachers with professional development on Best Practices for students Close Reading strategies when dissecting complex text. All teachers will plan to facilitate opportunities for all students to select and use strategies for Close Reading, rigorous instruction and responding to text dependent questions. |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | With the implementation of Close Reading strategies for the lowest performing, reading proficiency percentages will increase for the lowest performing students from 55% to 60%.           |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Georgette Jones (jonesg1@duvalschools.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Close Reading  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Close Reading provides students with the knowledge and skills necessary to be career and or college ready, as Close Reading provides a foundation for developing critical thinking skills. |

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Action Step</b>        |  |
| <b>Description</b>        | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To provide weekly common planning on Close Reading strategies</li> <li>2. To conduct focus walks for evidence of implementation</li> <li>3. At weekly PLC meetings, grade level team members will bring samples to show evidence that the steps of the close reading process are in use</li> <li>4. The leadership team will collaborate to analyze data and tier teachers for targeted coaching support</li> <li>5. The leadership team will monitor lesson plans to ensure inclusion of Close Reading instruction</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b> | Georgette Jones (jonesg1@duvalschools.org)   |

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

We will engage in shared collaboration, and everyone will take ownership to promote student success using a variety of resources and learning tools. We will also collaborate and brainstorm in common planning and PLCs to review, revise, and analyze our way of work. In addition, appropriate supplemental materials will be provided to support student learning.



## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

NA

#### PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

NA

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

NA

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

NA

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

NA

## Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| 1 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Math Lowest Performing Quartile |  |                |     | \$0.00  |
|---|----------|---|--|----------------|-----|---------|
|   | Function | Object  | Budget Focus   | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
|   |          |   | 2391 - Sabal Palm Elementary School  | Other          |     | \$0.00  |
|   |          |   | <i>Notes: Teachers provide tutoring before and after school to students who need additional remediation and support, at no cost to the students.</i> |                |     |         |

|          |               |   |   |                |               |               |
|----------|---------------|---|---|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>2</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Reading Lowest Performing Quartile</b> |   |                |               | <b>\$0.00</b> |
|          | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus  | Funding Source | FTE           | 2019-20       |
|          |               |   | 2391 - Sabal Palm Elementary School   | Other          |               | \$0.00        |
|          |               |   | <i>Notes: Teachers provide tutoring before and after school to students who need additional remediation in reading, at no cost to the students.</i> |                |               |               |
|          |               |   |   |                | <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$0.00</b> |