

Duval County Public Schools

Sabal Palm Elementary School



2021-22 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Sabal Palm Elementary School

1201 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

Demographics

Principal: Amber Felts

Start Date for this Principal: 7/3/2010

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	59%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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	49%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	B

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Graham, Linda	Principal	Leads and supervises the work of the instructional programs in a safe and productive learning environment, where all students and employees are valued and respected.
Jacob, Sonya	Assistant Principal	Assist with monitoring and supervising the implementation of the instructional program by teachers and safety of students.
Kumer, Christine	Teacher, K-12	Professional Development Facilitator and contact for new teachers
O'Neal, Asia	Assistant Principal	Provides support to teachers and students. In addition, assist with monitoring and supervising the implementation of the instructional program and the safety of students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/3/2010, 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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

Total number of students enrolled at the school

875

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

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

10

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	129	126	127	127	123	178	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	810
Attendance below 90 percent	2	24	22	25	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	3	2	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	1	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	2	9	26	46	23	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	1	13	30	42	41	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
Number of students 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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	10	26	32	28	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156

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	3	3	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/14/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				72%	50%	57%	64%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	56%	58%	46%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	50%	53%	27%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				80%	62%	63%	79%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				69%	63%	62%	73%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	52%	51%	61%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				75%	48%	53%	69%	55%	55%

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-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	72%	51%	21%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	73%	52%	21%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	50%	18%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	73%	61%	12%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	82%	64%	18%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	76%	57%	19%	60%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	76%	49%	27%	53%	23%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady and PMA3 data are compiled in the data chart below. This information will be used to determine next steps for student progress during the 2021-2022 school year.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34/24%	78/60%	105/74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/19%	22/48%	30/58%
	Students With Disabilities	1/4%	8/33%	11/38%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/17%	4/57%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23/16%	62/49%	100/71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/19%	12/27%	28/55%
	Students With Disabilities	3/11%	3/14%	12/41%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	2/33%	4/57%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52/39%	64/55%	64/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/27%	18/38%	23/45%
	Students With Disabilities	4/14%	6/25%	5/19%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24/18%	55/49%	82/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/4%	18/39%	30/60%
	Students With Disabilities	2/7%	6/27%	8/31%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	2/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	70/56%	73/57%	81/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/41%	19/40%	26/54%
	Students With Disabilities	8/31%	9/35%	11/46%
	English Language Learners	1/14%	0/0%	2/22%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	91/73%	93/73%	86/72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/62%	28/58%	23/50%
	Students With Disabilities	11/44%	14/54%	13/54%
	English Language Learners	3/43%	3/38%	3/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71/51%	89/63%	80/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/44%	23/48%	21/43%
	Students With Disabilities	8/26%	13/39%	12/40%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	80/57%	91/65%	85/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/50%	22/47%	22/44%
	Students With Disabilities	17/53%	15/47%	13/42%
	English Language Learners	2/40%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	84/61%	86/62%	88/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/49%	26/52%	24/55%
	Students With Disabilities	4/21%	3/15%	2/11%
	English Language Learners	1/50%	1/50%	1/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	96/69%	87/65%	76/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29/60%	28/58%	18/41%
	Students With Disabilities	10/56%	8/40%	5/26%
	English Language Learners	2/67%	2/100%	1/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	106/79%	102/76%	85/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/64%	33/69%	5/26%
	Students With Disabilities	10/63%	10/50%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	1/50%	1/50%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	41	59	53	53	62	38	45				
ELL	38			41							
ASN	69			75							
BLK	46	43	18	51	40	18	48				
HSP	61	64		59	71		65				
MUL	76			82							
WHT	66	59	50	74	72	38	66				
FRL	47	51	41	58	51	18	47				
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				
FRL	56	43	23	72	69	60	57				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	436
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	72
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	79
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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?

The lowest percentage quartile continue to show a decline in the core content areas across grade levels as well as subgroups: SWD, Economically Disadvantaged, and African American students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

FSA Lowest Percentage Quartile in math, 29%
FSA Learning gains in reading, 43%

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

Due to excessive absences, instability from online to brick and mortar, learning gaps increased in student knowledge and understanding of the content. With students returning to the school building for the 2021-2022 school year, a focus will be placed on closing the learning gap and increasing time with more small group instruction by using student data to drive instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the comparison data for progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, the reading gains reflected a gradual improvement. We expected a higher increase.

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

After reviewing past and present trends of instructional delivery, it was determined that small group instruction and allowing students adequate time on iReady and Achieve 3000 contributed to most of the improvement.

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

1. Utilize the Learning Arc to guide the lesson delivery
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. Implement effective lessons that are aligned to standards to meet student needs

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.

Online training through district specialists for each content area
Content area training during Early Release days
Collaboration with feedback about student work

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

Tutoring before and after school, support of a full-time standards coach, purposeful common planning collaboration, and release time for teachers to receive more professional development

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	B.E.S.T. Standards for reading and math were introduced in the primary grades over 2 years ago, but teachers received limited training on implementation. They utilized the supplemental resources that were available in the Curriculum Guides, but student work did not fully align with the standards. With a better understanding of B.E.S.T. Standards are benchmarks that will allow students the opportunity to discover strategies through exploration, rather than the strategies being taught in isolation.
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers in grades K-2 will dive deeper into learning the components and best practices to fully implement B.E.S.T. Standards in reading and math that will reflect a 20% increase in student performance for reading and math, as compared to the previous school year, 2020-2021.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through Walk-through visits, student work, data chats, exit tickets, and teacher evaluations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sonya Jacob (jacobs@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Common Planning - Standard Walkthrough Tool - Data Chats - Vertical Grade Level Team Collaboratoin - Research in schools using teacher teams with Common Planning finds that high levels of Common Planning are associated with higher student achievement gains, as measured by state math and reading test scores, compared with schools with less frequent or no Common Planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct Weekly Walkthroughs using the Standards Walkthrough Tool: Research has provided us with sound evidence stating that if student tasks and assessments do not align with standard-based instruction, it is impossible to determine mastery of standard or plan for next steps. Therefore, the Leadership team will use this strategy to ensure academic alignment is occurring weekly.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers attend training to gain a clear understanding of the B.E.S.T. Instructional Design (benchmark, strand, and standard) and implementation.
2. K-2 teachers will explore the resources for the Benchmark Advance Curriculum for implementation.
3. Educators will attend weekly Common Planning sessions to strategically plan lessons using Benchmark Advance Curriculum to teach B.E.S.T Standards.

Person Responsible Jasmine Butler (butlerj@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus	Math Lowest Performing Quartile
Description and Rationale:	In 2021, the lowest 25% was determined using 5th grade FSA data only, and Sabal Palm had an LPQ of 29% whereas in 2019, the LPQ was 55%. To increase the LPQ for math in 2022, the goal is to use the student current FSA Data and other diagnostics to drive instruction and identify targeted interventions for implementation.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2022, the lowest 25% will be determined using 4th and 5th grade FSA data. Therefore, the area of focus will be to increase the LPQ in math to 50% or higher.
Monitoring:	Administrators will monitor by conducting classroom data chats, walkthroughs, informal and formal observations, instructional reviews, common planning collaborations; review of student work and assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Linda Graham (grahaml@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	During PLCs, the Leadership Team will facilitate sessions by assisting teachers with becoming knowledgeable with the K-2 BEST Standards, 3-5 Florida Standards, and Item Specifications in order to leverage instructional resources to design coherent lessons that are directly aligned to Florida Standards. In addition, teachers need instructional strategies 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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has provided us with sound evidence stating that if student tasks and assessments do not align with standard-based instruction, it is impossible to determine mastery of standards/benchmarks or plan for next steps. This strategy will assist teachers with a deeper understanding of the Florida Standards and Benchmarks which will drive our standards-based instruction framework.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional development sessions will focus of creating Learning Arcs and deepening knowledge of the pedagogy needed to deliver effective instruction for specific groups.
2. Administrators, Lead Content Teachers, and Standards Coach will facilitate professional development sessions.
3. Administrators will conduct data chats and weekly walkthroughs to track and monitor progress.
4. Using common assessments and i-Ready data, teachers will plan and provide targeted small group instruction for all students.
5. Teachers will create differentiated centers to address the varying levels of students' academic needs.
6. Students will be provided an opportunity to attend before and after school tutoring for remediation.

Person Responsible Linda Graham (grahaml@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Due to COVID related issues, there was no state assessment data for the 2019-2020 school year and no results to reflect proficiency, gains, or lowest quartile in grades 3, 4, and 5. However, the 2019 FSA results were used for 5th grade in 2021 to determine gains and lowest quartile. Since this area was a previous focus in 2020, it was necessary to revisit this area of focus to track and determine student progress.

Measurable Outcome: 25% of students who scored a level 1 or 2 on the 4th grade FSA reading in 2021 will show gains on the FSA reading in 2022.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored using Classroom Walkthrough tool, Instructional Rounds, professional development, data chats with teachers and students, and teacher evaluations will help to determine student understanding and mastery of the standards in grades 3-5.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Asia O'Neal (oneala3@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Sabal Palm will track and monitor the performance on standards with the following strategies:
 -Standards Walkthrough Tool
 -Common Planning
 -Instructional lesson delivery
 - Conduct Weekly Walkthroughs using the Standards Walkthrough Tool:
 Research has provided us with sound evidence stating that if student tasks and assessments do not align with standard-based instruction, it is impossible to determine mastery of standard or plan for next steps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 -Common Planning Collaboration:
 Research has provided us with sound evidence stating that if student tasks and assessments do not align with standard-based instruction, it is impossible to determine mastery of standard or plan for next steps.
 Therefore, common planning will occur weekly to allow colleagues to discuss and share best teaching practices.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Conduct focus walks for evidence of implementation of Benchmarks and Standards.
2. During PLC meetings, grade level team members will bring samples to show evidence of student progress.
3. The administrative team will collaborate to analyze data and identify teachers for targeted coaching support.
4. Provide several opportunities for students to receive tutoring to address the learning shortfalls.
5. Increase the amount of time that students work on iReady and Achieve 3000 during the school day.

Person Responsible: Linda Graham (grahaml@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

During the 2020-2021 school year, there were a number of behavior issues reported regarding the use of inappropriate language and actions displayed by students. For the 2021-2022 school year, the focus will be on building relationships with students and improving the overall culture that will enhance expected student behavior.

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.

Based on the 2021 5 Essentials 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. We believe that all stakeholders play an important role in educating our youth, and their involvement makes a positive difference to ensure student success. Colleagues, including classroom teachers, paraprofessionals, ESE teachers, Speech, OT, and PT staff work collaboratively to meet the needs of every student and work closely to communicate with parents about student's social, emotional, and academic progress.

With a slight improvement in this area, we will continue to work on maintaining a positive school culture and environment for all stakeholders (staff, students, parents, community leaders). Our goal will be to increase the partnership between the community and school.

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

PTA and SAC meet monthly with school administration as key contributors in promoting our school culture and attainment of academic goals. This close partnership is a key connection for us to solicit all perspectives. With a slight improvement in this area, we will continue to work on maintaining a positive school culture and environment for all stakeholders (staff, students, parents, community leaders) by bringing

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: B.E.S.T. Standards	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00