

Duval County Public Schools

Sabal Palm Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

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: 6/15/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	59%
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: B (60%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (65%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	39%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

School Grades History

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

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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
Adams, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten teacher who supports in leading the academic focus and social well-being in primary grades.
Kelly, Terri	Teacher, ESE	Using her past experiences, she will brainstorm ideas to improve the school culture and promote the positive aspects of the school community.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/15/2020, Amber Felts

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.*

3

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

53

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	59%
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: B (60%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (65%)
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	142	149	141	170	166	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	936
Attendance below 90 percent	20	13	22	26	29	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	2	3	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	28	61	55	58	19	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	50	70	77	76	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311

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	28	51	52	56	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219

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	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/9/2020

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	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

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	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

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	
	(0)	(0)	(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
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%

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

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
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
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%	0
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%	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	84
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	50
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	69
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	74
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 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	75
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	58
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.

Based on i-Ready midyear data, students demonstrated a slight decrease in proficiency in math from the previous year students. According to mid-year iReady data, the overall math proficiency was 31% compared to last year 33%. In addition, the lowest performing quartile students demonstrated a decrease in proficiency from 26% last year to 23% this year. This indicates that there is a continuous need to differentiate instruction based on formative and summative assessment to maximize student achievement.

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

Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed the greatest decline. Small group instruction was not consistent for struggling learners, and learning tasks were not always grade level appropriate.

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 I-Ready midyear data, students demonstrated the most improvement with reading proficiency, with an increase from 31% last year to 38% this year. Contributing factors include identifying students deficiencies and rendering small group instruction. In addition, each administrator had an accountability list and pulled students 3 times a week for intensive support. Our final contributing factor was ensuring all students received differentiated, rigorous, and grade level standard based instruction to increase student achievement.

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

One area of most concern on the EWS data is attendance. There are a number of excessive tardies, early check -out, and absences that negatively impact student achievement. 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus	Math Lowest Performing Quartile
Description and Rationale:	The last FSA 2019, 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.
Measurable Outcome:	Learning gains will increase from 55% to 65% on the 2021 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 *Continue building Fluency - To promote mastery of math facts through incremental rehearsal

Action Steps to Implement

1. Using common assessments 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 teachers 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 and after school tutoring (at least twice a week) for remediation and enrichment of math concepts and standards.
5. During common planning, we will use the Equip rubric to calibrate and ensure students' work meets the complexity of the standards.
6. Set high standards for student and work with them to achieve those goals.

Person Responsible Georgette Jones (jonesg1@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reading Proficiency and Reading Lowest Performing Quartile 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 and Close Reading strategies when dissecting complex text. All teachers will facilitate opportunities for all students to select and use strategies for Close Reading, rigorous instruction and responding to text dependent questions.
Measurable Outcome:	Using Close Reading strategies, the lowest performing quartile, reading proficiency will increase by 5%, from 55% to 60% on the 2021 FSA reading and proficiency will increase from 72% to 77%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Georgette Jones (jonesg1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The implementation of Close Reading in the classroom with different groups of students has shown that when students study and analyze texts closely reflect rigor and purposeful learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Close reading provides students with the knowledge and skills necessary to be career and or college ready. Close reading sets a foundation for developing critical thinking skills. It shows a deeper connection and understanding to the written word.

Action Steps to Implement

1. To provide weekly common planning on Close Reading strategies
2. To conduct focus walks for evidence of implementation
3. At weekly PLC meeting, 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
6. Set high standards for student and work with them to achieve those goals.

Person Responsible Georgette Jones (jonesg1@duvalschools.org)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In the most recent 5Essentials Survey, Sabal Palm rated as "Moderately Organized" with improvements needed in the area of Effective Leaders. As a team, we will focus on building a more positive school culture in instructional leadership, teacher influence, and teacher-principal trust.

Measurable Outcome: With the implementation of Lastinger protocols and collaboration, the rating for Effective Leadership of the 5 Essentials will increase from 35-Weak to a rating of at least 45 Neutral.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Georgette Jones (jonesg1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Promote team-building activities (Lastinger) to boost morale and trust. This will improve communication among staff and administrators

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Lastinger is research-based protocols that promote high quality instruction, which work effectively with peers to improve instructional practice and learning. 5Essentials.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Conduct effective coaching conversations with colleagues
2. Create data displays based on a teacher-selected instructional focus.
3. Provide suggestions and encouragement to inspire teachers and share attainable methods.
4. Engage teachers in professional learning that takes into consideration the criteria of high quality professional development (modeling, book studies, etc.)

Person Responsible Georgette Jones (jonesg1@duvalschools.org)

1. Utilize district resources to implement cultural competence training with all staff members.
2. Assist teachers in setting higher goals for quality instruction.
3. Conduct regular check-ins and informal conversations to monitor progress and provide immediate feedback.
4. Provide incentives or "shout-outs" to recognize teachers, frequently.
- 5.

Person Responsible Linda Graham (grahaml@duvalschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A focus will be placed on aligning grade appropriate tasks with standards. Administrators will work closely with teachers to analyze student data and identify learning activities that support the state standards. Based on the need to provide deeper and more rigorous instruction, . Past data have shown that when teachers demonstrate solid knowledge of grade level content and standards, student performance improves as they become actively engage in their learning and apply knowledge.
Measurable Outcome:	At least 70% of students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate mastery of grade level standards in reading and math, as evidence by their performance on grade-appropriate tasks.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Linda Graham (grahaml@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementing Best Teaching Practices and rigorous instruction to teach grade appropriate standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the calibration on the Standards Based Dashboard, some learning tasks were simple and at times, did not align with grade level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will analyze and use student data to create grade level learning tasks that reflect rigor.
2. Teachers will participate in weekly common planning sessions to plan standards based instruction and assessments with grade level/ departmental teams.
3. Administrators will conduct instructional rounds using the Standards Based Walk-Through Tool to calibrate within the first few weeks of school and thereafter, use the results to help teachers plan prescriptive professional development.
4. Encourage teachers to participate in professional development opportunities to gain a thorough understanding of the curriculum and standards to guide their teaching and deliver effective instruction.
5. Administrators will empower teacher leaders to facilitate training for their colleagues on the implementation of Standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible Linda Graham (grahaml@duvalschools.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: During common planning, early dismissal training and grade level meetings, administration and school leadership teams will focus on improving collaboration among teachers, which is one of the 5 Essentials: Collaborative Teachers. This area was rated as "weak". Teachers will participate in a variety of shared collaboration settings that will promote professional growth and increase student success. Teachers will use a variety of resources and learning tools to promote effective teaching and learning through collaborative practices, collective responsibility, and teacher influence.

Measurable Outcome: The rating scale for "Collaborative Teachers" (1 of the 5Essentials addressed) will move from 22 (weak) to 49 (neutral).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Linda Graham (grahaml@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The 5Essentials

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In reviewing the 5Essentials, teacher emphasis on student development, school improvement, and professional growth indicate a positive difference for Collective Responsibility.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers engage in shared collaboration where teachers observe each other's practices and work with their assigned grade levels and administrators to disaggregated data, review student work, develop instructional strategies and plan purposeful instruction for all students.

Person Responsible Georgette Jones (jonesg1@duvalschools.org)

Work with the Leadership Teams to create several opportunities for "Team Building" activities during common planning, early release training, and faculty meetings.

Person Responsible Linda Graham (grahaml@duvalschools.org)

Collaborate with the Leadership Teams to determine ways to increase the frequency of school-wide motivational activities that recognize students who adhere to the Student Code of Conduct guidelines.

Person Responsible Linda Graham (grahaml@duvalschools.org)

Provide more opportunities for grade level planning where teachers can engage in regular data dives as well as vertical team alignments.

Person Responsible Linda Graham (grahaml@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Restructure the PBIS school plan to gain a better understanding of managing student discipline and implementing Restorative Justice more effective. This will be a team effort from all stakeholders, which will build stronger more trusting and respectful relationships among staff, students, and school administrators. It will also improve student-teacher relationships in all areas of the school, classroom and common areas.

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.

Based on the 2020 5Essentials data, Sabal Palm has created a positive and productive school environment where students thrive with the support and involvement of all stakeholders: parents, students, staff and community members. All stakeholders play an important role in educating our youth, and their involvement makes a positive difference to ensure student success. Communicatoin is key when involving stakeholders.

At Sabal Palm Elementary, we use communicate with our parents through various channels: school newsletters, School Messenger (Automated Phone messages), school website, translation of forms/letters and other essential forms of communication in parent's native language, provide interpreters for parent meetings to ensure that the parent understands and is able to respond in an effective manner.

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: Math				\$900.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	2391 - Sabal Palm Elementary School	General Fund		\$900.00
			<i>Notes: Math supplemental materials will be purchased to support classroom instruction and teacher development.</i>			

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA					\$1,200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	5100	510-Supplies	2391 - Sabal Palm Elementary School	General Fund		\$1,200.00	
			Notes: Reading supplemental materials will be purchased to support classroom instruction and teacher development.				
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team					\$900.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	2391 - Sabal Palm Elementary School	General Fund		\$900.00	
			Notes: Professional Book Studies on Effective Leadership : (Examples include but are not limited to "Leverage Leadership", "Collaborative Leadership", etc.)				
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction					\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning					\$0.00
Total:						\$3,000.00	