

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

# Sabal Point Elementary School

960 WEKIVA SPRINGS RD, Longwood, FL 32779

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0581

Demographics

# **Principal: Shannon Stokes**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Active   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021-22 Title I School  | No   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021-22 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3)   | 35%  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an<br>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<br>Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Grades History   | 2021-22: A (73%)<br>2018-19: A (72%)<br>2017-18: A (68%)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SI Region   | Southeast  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regional Executive Director   | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle   | N/A  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Support Tier  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ESSA Status   | ATSI   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo  | or more information, <u>click here</u> .   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## **School Board Approval**

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/25/2022.

## **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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

## 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               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 14 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

Seminole - 0581 - Sabal Point Elementary School - 2022-23 SIP

# **Sabal Point Elementary School**

960 WEKIVA SPRINGS RD, Longwood, FL 32779

# http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0581

# **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gr<br>(per MSID F |                     | 2021-22 Title I Scho | ol Disadvan         | 2 Economically<br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>ted on Survey 3) |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Elementary S<br>PK-5              | school              | No                   |                     | 35%  |
| Primary Servic<br>(per MSID F     |                     | Charter School       | (Reporte            | <b>9 Minority Rate</b><br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E                    | ducation            | No                   |                     | 41%  |
| School Grades Histo               | ory                 |                      |                     |  |
| Year<br>Grade                     | <b>2021-22</b><br>A | 2020-21              | <b>2019-20</b><br>A | <b>2018-19</b><br>A                                    |
| School Board Appro                | val                 |                      |                     |  |

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/25/2022.

# **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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

# 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.

The mission of Sabal Point Elementary School is to ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens.

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

Sabal Point Elementary will provide a learning environment that empowers students to embrace diversity, acquire knowledge independently, become lifelong learners and productive citizens. The staff, parents, and community will work collaboratively to provide a safe, healthy, and nurturing environment which fosters the academic, emotional, social, and physical growth of all students. We will promote lifelong learning and cultivate intellectual curiosity by providing a rigorous, balanced, and engaging curriculum. SPE will equip students with the skills necessary to meet opportunities and challenges with resilience, perseverance, and determination.

#### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name                 | Position Title         | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|----------------------|------------------------|---|
| Stokes,<br>Shannon   | Principal              | Overall function of school operations and instructional success of the school                     |
| Olvey, Maura         | Math Coach             | Assist principal in overall function of school operations and instructional development           |
| Nycz, Melissa        | Assistant<br>Principal | Assist Principal in overall function of school operations and instructional success of the school |
| Mays,<br>Cornelius   | Other                  | Assist principal in overall function of school operations and instructional development           |
| Gardner,<br>Cynthia  | Instructional<br>Coach | Assist principal in overall function of school operations and instructional development           |
| Geddie,<br>Stephanie | School<br>Counselor    | Assist principal in overall function of school operations and instructional development           |

## **Demographic Information**

## Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Shannon Stokes

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.

6

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school 48

**Total number of students enrolled at the school** 873

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year. 8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year. 5

**Demographic Data** 

# Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indiantar  | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator  | κ           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 139         | 144 | 119 | 157 | 169 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 870   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 1           | 14  | 3   | 0   | 0   | 2   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 1           | 12  | 4   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 5   | 8   | 16  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 4   | 9   | 13  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

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

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

# Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                           | κ           | 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1           | 11 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|                                     |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/15/2022

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level | Total |
|---|-------------|-------|
| Number of students enrolled                                       |             |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                                       |             |       |
| One or more suspensions   |             |       |
| Course failure in ELA   |             |       |
| Course failure in Math  |             |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment                      |             |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment                     |             |       |
| Number of sutdents with a substantial reading deficiency          |             |       |
| The number of students with two or more early warning indicators: |             |       |
| Indicator Gra   | de Level    | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators                              |             |       |
| The number of students identified as retainees:                   |             |       |
| Indicator Gra   | de Level    | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year                                   |             |       |
| Students retained two or more times                               |             |       |

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

| Indicator  |   |   |   |   | ( | Gra | ade | e Lo | eve | əl |    |    |    | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|------|-----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5   | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Number of sutdents with a substantial reading deficiency | 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                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | ve | I |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                            | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0   | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

# The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator                           | κ | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 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  |       |  |

# Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

# School Data Review

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      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Glade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 77%    | 65%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 76%    | 67%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 75%    |          |       |        |          |       | 66%    | 61%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 50%    |          |       |        |          |       | 55%    | 51%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 86%    | 46%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 85%    | 70%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 75%    |          |       |        |          |       | 81%    | 66%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 63%    |          |       |        |          |       | 65%    | 50%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 84%    | 65%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 74%    | 62%      | 53%   |

# Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State    | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 01        | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Co | mparison          |        |          |                                   | •        |                                |
| 02        | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Co | Cohort Comparison |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 03        | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019              | 77%    | 67%      | 10%                               | 58%      | 19%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison          | 0%     |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 04        | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019              | 69%    | 65%      | 4%                                | 58%      | 11%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison          | -77%   |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 05        | 2022              |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|           | 2019              | 79%    | 64%      | 15%                               | 56%      | 23%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison          | -69%   |          |                                   | <b>.</b> |                                |

|                   |                   |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade             | Year              | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparisor |
| 01                | 2022              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|                   | 2019              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Co         | mparison          |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 02                | 2022              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|                   | 2019              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Co         | Cohort Comparison |        |          |                                   | •     |                                |
| 03                | 2022              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|                   | 2019              | 86%    | 71%      | 15%                               | 62%   | 24%                            |
| Cohort Co         | mparison          | 0%     |          |                                   | •     |                                |
| 04                | 2022              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|                   | 2019              | 84%    | 72%      | 12%                               | 64%   | 20%                            |
| Cohort Comparison |                   | -86%   |          |                                   | · ·   |                                |
| 05                | 2022              |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|                   | 2019              | 82%    | 65%      | 17%                               | 60%   | 22%                            |
| Cohort Co         | mparison          | -84%   |          |                                   | · · · |                                |

|             |          |        | SCIEN    | CE                                |       |                                |
|-------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade       | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05          | 2022     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|             | 2019     | 73%    | 62%      | 11%                               | 53%   | 20%                            |
| Cohort Corr | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2022      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 |
| SWD       | 46          | 50        | 45                | 50           | 46         | 26                 | 57          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 59          | 50        |                   | 71           | 67         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 77          |           |                   | 100          |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 29          | 36        | 36                | 46           | 43         |                    | 36          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 72          | 65        | 42                | 81           | 67         | 63                 | 76          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 77          | 94        |                   | 77           | 76         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 83          | 79        | 56                | 92           | 79         | 68                 | 91          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 65          | 65        | 42                | 74           | 63         | 47                 | 71          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2021      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 48          | 62        | 50                | 47           | 52         | 47                 | 39          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 62          |           |                   | 76           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 92          |           |                   | 92           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 56          | 73        |                   | 56           | 36         |                    | 40          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 76          | 83        | 91                | 74           | 60         |                    | 72          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 81          | 70        |                   | 87           | 90         |                    | 55          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 86          | 85        | 55                | 86           | 76         | 57                 | 82          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 70          | 78        | 73                | 68           | 56         | 53                 | 62          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 42          | 56        | 48                | 49           | 59         | 54                 | 16          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 42          | 72        | 69                | 68           | 78         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 82          | 83        |                   | 82           | 85         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 60          | 45        |                   | 67           | 65         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 60          | 51        | 38                | 85           | 78         | 72                 | 70          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 85          | 85        |                   | 88           | 75         |                    | 71          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 83          | 72        | 65                | 87           | 84         | 66                 | 80          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 59          | 60        | 56                | 74           | 73         | 64                 | 57          |            |              |                         |                           |

# ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 73   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |      |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 510  |

| ESSA Federal Index   |      |
|--|------|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 7    |
| Percent Tested   | 100% |
| Subgroup Data  |      |
| Students With Disabilities   |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 46   |
| 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                                      | 62   |
| 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                                       |      |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        | 0    |
| Asian Students   |      |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 89   |
| 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                                | 38   |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0    |
| Hispanic Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 67   |
| 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   | 81   |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO   |

| Multiracial Students   | -   |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0   |
| 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%           | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 78  |
| 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                                | 61  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

# Part III: Planning for Improvement

# Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

# What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

On the 2022 FSA, 3rd Grade ELA proficiency decreased 8% (83% to 75%) and 3rd Grade Math proficiency increased 5% (80% to 85%).

On the 2022 FSA, 4th Grade ELA proficiency decreased 7% (81% to 74%) and 4th Grade Math proficiency increased 2% (84% to 86%).

On the 2022 FSA, 5th Grade ELA proficiency remained at 82% and 5th Grade Math proficiency increased 4% (80% to 84%).

On the 2022 SSA, 5th Grade Science proficiency increased 12% (70% to 82%).

# What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

On the 2022 FSA, 3rd Grade ELA proficiency decreased 8% (83% to 75%). On the 2022 FSA, 4th Grade ELA proficiency decreased 7% (81% to 74%)

# What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Factors contributing to the low performance ELA proficiency include disruption in instructional continuity due to the pandemic that further widened gaps in students' foundational skills. Actions to support

improvement in these areas will include frequent formative progress monitoring with target support and acceleration in identified areas of need.

# What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

On the 2022 FSA, 3rd Grade Math proficiency increased 5% (80% to 85%). On the 2022 FSA, 4th Grade Math proficiency increased 2% (84% to 86%). On the 2022 FSA, 5th Grade Math proficiency increased 4% (80% to 84%). On the 2022 SSA, 5th Grade Science proficiency increased 12% (70% to 82%).

# What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Deliberate monitoring of specific student groups contributed to this improvement. Actions included focus on the monitoring of the lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students along with standards based tutoring.

# What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Administration will meet with the Leadership Team weekly to review data and readjust PLC's as needed. Teachers will participate in weekly PLC's with the ELA Coach and Math/Science Coach to review data (iReady, Cold Reads, Unit Assessments, ORF's, DRA's, Sight Words, Ongoing Progress Monitoring, etc.) and determine needs/resources for differentiated instruction.

All teachers/students will participate in a Walk-to Intervention Model (Gators on the Go) four days a week that provides differentiated instruction using the iReady Toolbox, Curriculum Project and other resources that meet the needs of every student.

Administration will conduct frequent walkthroughs and observations and provide immediate feedback to improve instruction and increase academic achievement.

# Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will be focused on the development of highly effective professional learning communities and how school-based leaders can foster the growth and development of teacher collaboration for student success.

# Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include focus on instructional strategies Sustainability of improvement efforts Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include support of standards based instruction across all content areas, social emotional learning support for students and families, data driven tutoring and acceleration support and expanded use of SCPS early warning tracking and MTSS based support.

## Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

2

# **#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**

| Area of Focus Description<br>and Rationale:<br>Include a rationale that<br>explains how it was identified<br>as a critical need from the<br>data reviewed.                             | Increasing academic achievement of Black/African American students.<br>ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority<br>need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce<br>achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic<br>success.  |
|--|---|
| Measurable Outcome:<br>State the specific measurable<br>outcome the school plans to<br>achieve. This should be a<br>data based, objective<br>outcome.                                  | Increase achievement and learning gains for Black/African American students.  |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe how this Area of<br>Focus will be monitored for<br>the desired outcome.  | This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.   |
| Person responsible for<br>monitoring outcome:  | Shannon Stokes (shannon_akerson@scps.k12.fl.us)   |
| Evidence-based Strategy:<br>Describe the evidence-based<br>strategy being implemented<br>for this Area of Focus.   | Lessons aligned to B.E.S.T. benchmarks at the appropriate grade level<br>of complexity with ongoing feedback loops between leadership and<br>teachers, students and teachers and student with students and PLCs<br>focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of<br>learning. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based<br>Strategy:<br>Explain the rationale for<br>selecting this specific<br>strategy. Describe the<br>resources/criteria used for<br>selecting this strategy. | Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these<br>specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will<br>improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy<br>is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers. |
| Action Steps to Implement<br>List the action steps that will be ta<br>person responsible for monitoring  | aken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the<br>geach step.   |
| PLC Data Chats   |   |

Monitor iReady/FAST data within PLCs One on One Data Chats with Teachers

Person Responsible

Shannon Stokes (shannon\_akerson@scps.k12.fl.us)

# **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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

# Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Teachers and administrators are continually involved in local events and often invited to participate in their community's celebrations. Administrators and teachers reach out to local businesses for participation in the school's business partners programs. As applicable, administrators serve on local rotary clubs, chambers, etc. In addition, faith-based leaders are invited to form relationships with local schools.

# Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

All stakeholders involved with Sabal Point work to promote a positive culture and environment. Administrators support staff through professional development, professional learning communities and staff meetings to meet the academic and social/emotional needs of our students. All stakeholders (classroom teachers, ESE teachers, ESOL teachers, instructional coaches, support staff, parents, community, business partners and school board members) work together to build positive relationships with our students.