

Duval County Public Schools

Sandalwood High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Sandalwood High School

2750 JOHN PROM BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32246

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

Demographics

Principal: Saryn Hatcher

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
2019-20 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: A (70%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Sandalwood High School

2750 JOHN PROM BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32246

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	61%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career and life.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hatcher, Saryn	Principal	Manage the operations of the school. Responsible for ensuring the school runs smoothly, and remains safe, while providing an excellent learning environment for all students.
	Assistant Principal	
Motley, Rhonda	Assistant Principal	
Lakatos, Aaron	Assistant Principal	
Barney, Linda	Dean	
Gardiner, Karen	Other	
Gaspard, Jacqueline	Instructional Coach	Teacher and Interventionist
Colvin, Nancy		ESE Coordinator
Murphy, Damon	Dean	9-10 Boys Discipline
Watanabe, Kimi	Teacher, K-12	AVID Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/30/2020, Saryn Hatcher

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

188

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
2019-20 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: A (70%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (60%)
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 .	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	950	720	644	640	2954
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	77	54	8	217
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	98	96	78	402
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	76	44	8	188
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	330	296	167	138	931

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total		
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/30/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	813	873	644	601	2931
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	77	54	6	215
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	122	96	78	426
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	70	45	12	192
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	321	296	167	138	922

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	813	873	644	601	2931
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	77	54	6	215
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	122	96	78	426
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	70	45	12	192
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	321	296	167	138	922

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	51%	47%	56%	54%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	48%	51%	52%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	42%	42%	39%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	67%	51%	51%	77%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	65%	52%	48%	60%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	47%	45%	65%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	73%	65%	68%	77%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	70%	73%	80%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	49%	48%	1%	55%	-6%
	2018	55%	48%	7%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	49%	48%	1%	53%	-4%
	2018	50%	49%	1%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	67%	2%	67%	2%
2018	66%	63%	3%	65%	1%
Compare		3%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	68%	13%	70%	11%
2018	79%	64%	15%	68%	11%
Compare		2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	57%	-4%	61%	-8%
2018	78%	61%	17%	62%	16%
Compare		-25%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	61%	13%	57%	17%
2018	78%	57%	21%	56%	22%
Compare		-4%			

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	33	37	35	56	54	63	46	52		95	49
ELL	24	39	37	60	64	59	54	63		92	77
AMI	36	50									
ASN	62	46	16	79	73	92	80	85		98	91

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
BLK	39	41	38	59	64	58	59	72		94	82
HSP	43	46	39	64	61	56	66	79		92	80
MUL	57	41	37	70	66		83	87		94	87
WHT	61	51	39	73	68	73	85	89		97	90
FRL	43	42	36	65	63	68	68	72		93	79
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	38	47	37	65	69	69	45	55		97	58
ELL	21	38	32	74	82	84	40	50		94	81
ASN	62	50	47	88	79	85	71	85		100	92
BLK	44	44	35	73	69	64	48	69		98	83
HSP	45	41	32	75	70	79	60	75		99	89
MUL	72	58	60	84	91		75	79		100	90
WHT	63	55	50	84	74	81	78	86		96	91
FRL	48	45	38	78	72	75	58	74		95	87
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	18	30	25	70	72	65	36	56		67	82
ELL	15	45	48	72	58	67	22	57		75	90
ASN	68	64	53	87	59		82	86		89	95
BLK	37	40	31	67	63	62	70	71		88	91
HSP	45	48	41	74	62	69	68	70		88	85
MUL	67	57	25	80	69	88	83	91		95	75
WHT	64	57	47	82	57	65	83	86		93	93
FRL	43	43	37	74	60	68	69	68		82	86

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	66
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	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	730
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	43
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	72
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	69
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	73
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	63
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

English Language Arts for 9th grade was our lowest group regarding performance. A 6% drop in proficiency as seen. This can be attributed to motivation and the testing environment. All diagnostic data points available during the school indicated improvement including district predictive software. Over complication of the ELA to reading curricular relationship was a key contributing factor. Testing interruptions were also a key aspect. Data had been increasing over the prior 2 years.

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

Algebra 1 showed our greatest decline.

1. The lowest of the low students were sent to Algebra 1a then LAM and had to now take Algebra 1. In an attempt increase the probability of their success, we have put off taking Algebra 1 and the corresponding assessment for 3 years. They had to take that test at some point.
2. We had a key teacher leave in the middle of the year and her replacement didn't have the rigor she needed. The teacher who left was trending towards 70+% gains.
3. Another teacher who was put back into the department really struggled. She had little support at times. She knew the content but struggled with classroom management. Also didn't want to move many kids down because she is not on performance pay.

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.

9th grade ELA showed a 6% gap between the State and the school. The factors that contributed to this were the disjointedness of the English curriculum and the Reading curriculum. Have two preps that showed no thematic relationship did not maximize the time spent on non-fiction reading analysis, writing in response to that reading, and the ability to successfully address deficiencies in sub-skills.

This is only a hypothesis as the data from our mid-year scrimmage, Achieve 3000, and SAS data predictions all showed a gain in proficiency.

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

Biology data indicated 3% improvement from the prior year. Sandalwood still outpaces the school district and state. Our school was more intentional with data analysis, safety nets, and interventions after the mid-year scrimmage. We procured a teacher to do targeted pull-out sessions with incentives for the students who participated. These sessions were data-driven in focus and developed by the teachers to maintain continuity with the classroom work and expectations.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Two areas of concern are the numbers of students who have been suspended multiple times and the number of students in lower grades who are failing either English or Math. Each of these indicators is directly related to one another. Removing students from class is preventing the students from receiving the instruction needed. If we drilled down, I believe we would find that the students who are suspended multiple times, also have issues with attendance (tardiness and skipping), and they likely are failing multiple courses leading to feelings of doubt regarding their ability to overcome the barriers that their behavior is creating.

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

1. Algebra 1
2. English 1
3. English 2
4. Geometry
5. Biology

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A slight majority of classrooms are implementing standards aligned instruction with appropriate level of student tasks/experiences. However, there seems to be a disconnect between what tasks are being completed by students, and their understanding of the assessment resulting in a drop in proficiency.

In developing the teachers with implementing standards-based instruction it is important that we provide training on how to utilize the Learning Arc to decrease the academic deficit. This will enable teachers to plan effective lessons using the item specifications and ALDS to make sure the learning task are aligned to the standard.

Measurable Outcome: A vast majority of Sandalwood's core content classes will show progress in implementing standards-based planning procedures that produce products of aligned instruction. as evident using the Walkthrough Tool. Teachers will show an increase in assessing student learning outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Saryn Hatcher (hatchers@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: To deliver standards-based instruction by unpacking standards, utilizing learning arcs, item specs, and ALDS to enhance teachers ability to create and deliver lessons aligned to the learning arcs. Common planning will show assessments and learning tasks for student mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: As expressed in the Opportunity myth, we will ensure students are getting standards-aligned grade appropriate instruction by conducting daily walkthroughs, so they are prepared for state assessments, and exhibit mastery/understanding of the standard.

Action Steps to Implement

Ms. Deangelico (Math Lead), Ms. Gaspard (Reading Coach), and Ms. Elkins (Lead U.S. History) will facilitate professional development for teachers during pre-planning on the Learning Arc in core accountability areas.

Person Responsible Saryn Hatcher (hatchers@duvalschools.org)

Administrators and Coaches will provide support during weekly PLC time planning standards based instruction utilizing the Learning Arc template for each standard.

Person Responsible Saryn Hatcher (hatchers@duvalschools.org)

Continue to conduct Standards-Based walkthroughs with administration and academic coaches weekly.

Person Responsible Saryn Hatcher (hatchers@duvalschools.org)

Provide instructional support via coaching to identified teachers in the specific areas of need for standards based instruction.

Person Responsible Jacqueline Gaspard (paulj1@duvalschools.org)

Unpack standards by utilizing the Learning Arc template to align instruction to standards and create detailed lesson plans.

Person Responsible Rhonda Motley (motleyr@duvalschools.org)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Allow teachers to develop an effective and consistent system of buy-in and responsibility of school iprovement efforts. Create an environment that supports teachers in developing the whole child in order to support student learning and improvement in all core subjects to include student engagement. Based on the 5 Essentials survey, the three weakest areas included: Teacher Innovation (Overall score of 11 out of 100), Teacher Influence (Overall score of 12 out of 100) and Collective Responsibility (Overall score of 19 out of 100).

Measurable Outcome: According to 5-Essential Survey, increase teacher participation in overall school improvement efforts by 10% at the end of the first semester.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Saryn Hatcher (hatchers@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: A consistent school-wide system such as PBIS that focuses on attendance, behavior and academic progress will result in more time in class, and greater student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The school-wide PBIS plan will support student behavior, attendance and academic progress. When looking at our attendance and academic success data, absenteeism has a major impact on student achievement. therefore we need to target students to adjust behavior and attendance to improve academics. The Dean of Student Services, Graduation Coach and Guidance Counselor will lead monitor warning systems on a weekly basis. Small group meetings will take place to evaluate students potential for high school success.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a school PBIS team that meets bi-weekly and provide reports for the Principal's staff newsletter. Team will include three classroom teachers and the Dean of Student Services, Guidance Counselor and Graduation Coach.

Person Responsible Damon Murphy (murphyd@duvalschools.org)

Train teachers on PBIS Plan

Person Responsible Linda Barney (barneyl@duvalschools.org)

PBIS team will adjust plan to target attendance interventions at faculty meetings.

Person Responsible Linda Barney (barneyl@duvalschools.org)

Review implementation of PBIS plan based on attendance, discipline, and early warning systems. Guidance Counselor, Graduation Coach and Dean of Student Services.

Person Responsible Damon Murphy (murphyd@duvalschools.org)

Highlight Teacher of the Month through-out the school

Person Responsible Saryn Hatcher (hatchers@duvalschools.org)

Create an new teacher on-boarding program using technology.

Person Responsible Saryn Hatcher (hatchers@duvalschools.org)

Attend all Shared Decision Making meetings and colloborate with teachers on school-based decisions.

Person Responsible Saryn Hatcher (hatchers@duvalschools.org)

Create a leadership book study on - Awesome Sauce (By: Josh Stock) The ability to use video in an innovative way to communicate and provide student engagement The book will also help teachers use video to address common issues to enhance classroom culture and manage parent communication.

Person Responsible Jacqueline Gaspard (paulj1@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

na

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Increase stakeholder engagement & participation:

- 1). School Advisory Council (SAC) & Parent Teacher Student Assoc. (PTSA) meetings will be held monthly to involve parents in the coordination and improvement of school activities.
- 2). Annual Title I Meeting it will be placed on the school website, communicated through School Messenger & hard copies available in our Parent Resource Room.
- 3). Provide technology resources for parents to include tablets, laptops & interactive equipment on campus increasing communication to stakeholders.
- 4). Student work centers will be created in the Media Center for students to have access to technology
- 5). Lending libraries on campus where parents/students can check out self-help books.
- 6). Social Media campaign to communicate to Parents/Students additional resources available for school improvement and overall readiness.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$4,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3374	310-Professional and Technical Services	2371 - Sandalwood High School	School Improvement Funds		\$4,500.00
			<i>Notes: Teacher training by instructional coaches on literacy building skills and assessment alignment for standards.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback				\$0.00
					Total:	\$4,500.00