

Duval County Public Schools

Sabal Palm Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

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

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

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan 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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

Sabal Palm Elementary School

1201 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

School Demographics

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

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	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 Accel 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

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

#1	
Title	Math Lowest Performing Quartile
Rationale	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.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Learning gains will increase from 55% to 65% on the 2020 math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Georgette Jones (jonesg1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Math Reasoning Math Fluency
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	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 •Fluency - To Promote Mastery of Math Facts Through Incremental Rehearsal
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Using common assessment and i-Ready data, teachers will plan and provide targeted small group instruction for all students. 2. Using the MTSS Model, additional support for Tier 3 students will be provided by teacher at least 3 times per week 3. Teachers will create differentiated centers to address the varying levels of students' academic needs. 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. 5. During common planning, we will use the Equip Rubric to calibrate and ensure student work meets the complexity of the standards.
Person Responsible	Georgette Jones (jonesg1@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Reading Lowest Performing Quartile
Rationale	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.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	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%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Georgette Jones (jonesg1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Close Reading
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	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.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To provide weekly common planning on Close Reading strategies 2. To conduct focus walks for evidence of implementation 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 4. The leadership team will collaborate to analyze data and tier teachers for targeted coaching support 5. The leadership team will monitor lesson plans to ensure inclusion of Close Reading instruction
Person Responsible	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
			Notes: Teachers provide tutoring before and after school to students who need additional remediation and support, at no cost to the students.			

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reading 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 in reading, at no cost to the students.</i>			
Total:						\$0.00