Sabal Palm Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sabal Palm Elementary School

1201 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

http://www.duvalschools.org/spe

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Sabal Palm's mission is to provide a rigorous and nurturing learning environment that is Child-Centered and Purpose-Driven, while cultivating positive relationships with all stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sabal Palm's vision is to prepare lifelong learners for career success through relationships, rigorous education, and parent and community involvement.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Felts, Amber	Principal	Provides a shared vision for data-driven decision-making, ensures that teachers implement the curriculum with fidelity, manages school schedules to maximize support staff use, ensures that the shared decision-making process is utilized effectively, and communicates with parents to establish a partnership between school and home.
O'Neal, Asia	Assistant Principal	- Assist with monitoring and supervising the implementation of instructional programs by teachers and the safety of students. - Observe and evaluate the implementation of benchmarks-aligned instruction - Collects data and analyzes all data points to make effective instructional decisions - Leads and participates in professional development sessions - Leads PBIS initiatives to increase and monitor positive behavior to decrease undesired behavior - Collaborates with the school-based MTSS team, the school psychologist, counselor, and social worker to identify at-risk students based on social history, academic attendance, and other Early Warning Indicators.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Through the School Advisory Council, Sabal Palm Elementary School involves its stakeholders in the SIP development process. Our SAC meets monthly to discuss the school's overall health and to resolve improvement areas identified by administration, faculty, parents, students, and the community.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school leadership team will hold regular meetings to analyze data from a variety of assessments, including state and district assessments. After analyzing this information, the leadership team will develop intervention and enrichment systems for identified students.

The school leadership team and faculty will create and continuously monitor the 2023-2024 4-Step Plan to track learning gains and academic proficiency.

During Admin Common Planning and Data Chats, the school leadership team and faculty will work together to monitor students' progress toward proficiency on state benchmarks and the defined SIP goals.

The administration will update the SAC on the school's condition, including our students' performance on state and district assessments. Additionally, the administration team will provide updates on student achievement about our SIP goals specifically.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	48%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	59%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A
	2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	16	26	17	16	26	15	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	30	37	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	25	34	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	17	4	10	49	31	62	0	0	0	173

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	69	87	75	81	95	72	0	0	0	479

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	29	31	25	30	23	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	0	5	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	3	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	2	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	22	25	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	23	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	6	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	64

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	10	18	25	11	20	0	0	0	87

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	29	31	25	30	23	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	0	5	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	3	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	2	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	22	25	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	23	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	6	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	64

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	10	18	25	11	20	0	0	0	87

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	5	3	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	56	48	53	58	50	56	62		
ELA Learning Gains				53			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			43		
Math Achievement*	62	58	59	70	48	50	68		
Math Learning Gains				58			65		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			29		
Science Achievement*	61	52	54	66	59	59	62		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	67	54	59	87			50		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	317
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	1	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	47			
BLK	54			
HSP	56			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	68			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	53			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	46			
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	49			
HSP	50			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	56			62			61					67
SWD	28			42			47				4	
ELL	22			44							3	67
AMI												
ASN	35			59							2	
BLK	48			51			56				4	
HSP	46			48			47				4	
MUL	68			71							3	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	60			69			67				4	
FRL	46			50			53				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	58	53	40	70	58	40	66					87
SWD	41	36	33	55	54	46	55					
ELL	30	38		44	44							87
AMI												
ASN	64			79								
BLK	45	50	50	59	53	44	43					
HSP	47	41	31	60	44	33	53					87
MUL	70	74		81	68		73					
PAC												
WHT	62	56	42	75	62	48	75					
FRL	47	51	39	58	52	43	51					87

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	62	57	43	68	65	29	62					50
SWD	41	59	53	53	62	38	45					
ELL	38			41								50
AMI												
ASN	69			75								
BLK	46	43	18	51	40	18	48					
HSP	61	64		59	71		65					55
MUL	76			82								
PAC												
WHT	66	59	50	74	72	38	66					
FRL	47	51	41	58	51	18	47					55

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	47%	-2%	54%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	50%	9%	58%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	46%	23%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	74%	59%	15%	59%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	58%	10%	61%	7%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	52%	-3%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	60%	48%	12%	51%	9%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our 5th Grade ELA Proficiency was the lowest for SY22-23 at 45%. From SY21-22, we saw a decline of 9 percentage points from 54%.

Some contributing factors to the decline in ELA are new 5th-grade team members, one of whom was out for extended leave. Differentiated small-group interventions were not implemented with fidelity due to a sub teacher.

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

Our 5th Grade Math Proficiency dropped 15 points from the previous year - showing a decrease from 64% to 49% proficiency in 5th-grade math.

We had some new 5th-grade team members for the school year. Additionally, there were inconsistencies on intentional and effective planning and implementation for differentiated small-group instruction.

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.

N/A

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

Our 3rd Grade ELA showed the most improvement, increasing by ten percentage points from SY21-22 (59%) to SY 22-23 (69%). We placed an increased focus on collaborative planning and district professional development to assist in this area.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

An area of need for us is attendance according to our EWS data.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. Science Proficiency
4. PD in Tier 1 Instruction / Common Planning & Benchmarks Aligned Tasks
5. Small Group Differentiated Instruction

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the decline in ELA proficiency, our focus will be on increasing reading achievement by creating systems of support for our targeted group with data-driven small group instruction. Recent data trends indicate that student proficiency is on the decline in ELA 2020 to 2023.

Our overall 22-23 ELA proficiency for grades 3-5 was 57%. Specifically, 5th grade proficiency declined 9 percentage points from the previous school year, indicating a need for intensive, data-driven research-based interventions and instruction.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

District and state progress monitoring assessments will indicate a minimum increase of at least 11 percentage points in ELA proficiency by the end of the 2023-2024 school year, moving from 57% to 68%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The school leadership team will review lesson plans during Common Planning times and provide support and feedback to teachers, specifically when designing small group instruction. Classroom teachers will use small group differentiated instruction, RtI, District and state assessments, and Unit assessments to monitor for the desired outcome. Data will be tracked and discussed in Admin/Teacher Data Chats. Frequent classroom walkthroughs will ensure small group instruction is being implemented with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Felts (feltsa@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Tier I Supports incorporate rigorous instruction through the use of anchor charts, journals, and informal and formal assessments. Lesson plans should include both Tier 1 and Tier 2 supports.

Professional Development- To enhance instructional delivery, teachers will have the opportunity to attend district based professional development sessions. Teachers will then share out what was learned during Common Planning or Early Release in a train-the-trainer type fashion.

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Strategic, data-driven, teacher-led small groups for Tier2 differentiated supports to work toward benchmark mastery will allow teachers to meet students at individual levels and support their needs. Strategies/Resources may include use of the following:

Heggerty for Gr K-2
Seeing Stars for ESE students
Phonics for Reading
UFLI for Gr 3-5 during scheduled WIN intervention time
Any recommended small group resources recommended in the district OneNote Curriculum Guides

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier I supports provide differentiation and scaffolding to address diverse classroom requirements and skill levels. Students can use multiple learning modalities to comprehend concepts and real-world experiences as a result of aligned investigations.

Professional Development- Well-designed and implemented PD should be considered an essential component of a comprehensive system of teaching and learning that supports students to develop the knowledge, skills, and competencies they need to thrive in the 21st century.

Small group instruction is a research-based best practice for delivering instruction. The resources available for teachers are also research-based and have been proven to show an increase in student literacy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- Administrative classroom walkthroughs
- Data chats
- Common Planning - Admin and teachers meet on a rotational schedule to work on lesson planning and instructional alignment, specifically on small group instructional plan
- Design and facilitate small groups - teachers, leadership team, select paras, and specialists, will pull Tiered groups for support throughout the school year

Person Responsible: Amber Felts (feltsa@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

From the 5 Essentials survey, collective responsibility was the lowest measure in the collaborative teachers domain. Collective responsibility scored at 1 and decreased 5 from the previous year.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

If instructional leadership increased in the building then the Collaborative Teachers domain (specifically the Collaborative Practices measure) will increase on the 2024 survey.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate with one another in non-threatening environments. Implement Teaching Tuesday (led by teachers) to allow teachers opportunities to share ideas and resources that are having a positive impact on standards based instruction and student growth within their classrooms. Provide opportunities for relationship building and professional discourse regularly within the school. Conduct regular classroom walkthroughs. Provide opportunities for teachers to regularly visit and observe other classroom teachers as part of the Common Planning Cycle.

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

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Schools with higher culture and climate ratings tend to work efficiently to solve problems that may arise in the school including how to best serve students and families and how to support each other professionally through modeling of excellent instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If Sabal Palm is able to provide additional collaborative opportunities to teachers, we will be able to see an increase in school morale and collective responsibility, which will positively impact student learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- Weekly Walkthroughs to monitor the transfer of learning from the Common Planning cycles - Ideas for Teacher Tuesday
- Weekly Common Planning sessions - To allow teachers to collaborate and plan to share ideas with each other.

Person Responsible: Asia O'Neal (oneala3@duvalschools.org)

By When: End of the School Year

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our overall 22-23 Science achievement for grade 5 was 60%, which was a 6 point decline from the previous school year.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our goal is to increase Science proficiency to 70% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The school leadership team will monitor lesson plans and quarterly grades through data chats and Common Planning, providing specific and strategic support for small group instruction. Close progress monitoring of state and district assessments will be tracked on a shareable spreadsheet. The school leadership team will also monitor the fidelity of Science instruction and aligned investigations through frequent classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Felts (feltsa@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Tier I Support incorporates rigorous instruction through the use of anchor charts, journals, and technology, and the aligned investigations support state benchmarks via hands-on experimentation and laboratories.

Professional Development- To enhance instructional delivery, teachers will have the opportunity to attend district based professional development session.

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Strategic, data-driven, teacher-led small groups for Tier2 differentiated supports to work toward benchmark mastery will allow teachers to meet students at individual levels and support their needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier I supports provide differentiation and scaffolding to address diverse classroom requirements and skill levels. Students can use multiple learning modalities to comprehend concepts and real-world experiences as a result of aligned investigations.

Professional Development- Well-designed and implemented PD should be considered an essential component of a comprehensive system of teaching and learning that supports students to develop the knowledge, skills, and competencies they need to thrive in the 21st century.

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Small group instruction is proven to use data to drive individual student results.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- Common Planning - Admin and teachers meet on a rotational schedule to work on lesson planning and instructional alignment, specifically on small group instructional plan
- Benchmark Walkthroughs
- Data Chats- School Leadership team will track student data to ensure we are staying the course to meeting and exceeding our goal.
- Analyze data to determine next steps in our action plan

Person Responsible: Amber Felts (feltsa@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our overall 22-23 Math achievement for grade 5 was 49%, which was a 15 point decline from the previous school year.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our goal is to increase proficiency in Grade 5 Math to 60% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The school leadership team will monitor lesson plans and quarterly grades through data chats and Common Planning, providing specific and strategic support for small group instruction. Close progress monitoring of state and district assessments will be tracked on a shareable spreadsheet. The school leadership team will also monitor the fidelity of Math instruction and aligned investigations through frequent classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Asia O'Neal (oneala3@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Tier I Supports incorporate rigorous instruction through the use of anchor charts, journals, informal and formal assessments, and technology. Lesson plans should include both Tier 1 and Tier 2 supports.

Professional Development- To enhance instructional delivery, teachers will have the opportunity to attend district based professional development sessions. Teachers will then share out what was learned during Common Planning or Early Release in a train-the-trainer type fashion.

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Strategic, data-driven, teacher-led small groups for Tier2 differentiated supports to work toward benchmark mastery will allow teachers to meet students at individual levels and support their needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier I supports provide differentiation and scaffolding to address diverse classroom requirements and skill levels. Students can use multiple learning modalities to comprehend concepts and real-world experiences as a result of aligned investigations.

Professional Development- Well-designed and implemented PD should be considered an essential component of a comprehensive system of teaching and learning that supports students to develop the knowledge, skills, and competencies they need to thrive in the 21st century.

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Small group instruction is proven to use data to drive individual student results.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- Common Planning - Admin and teachers meet on a rotational schedule to work on lesson planning and instructional alignment, specifically on small group instructional plan
- Benchmark Walkthroughs
- Data Chats- School Leadership team will track student data to ensure we are staying the course to meeting and exceeding our goal.
- Analyze data to determine next steps in our action plan

Person Responsible: Asia O'Neal (oneala3@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Our K-2 reading proficiency data for SY22-23 is as follows: 78% for Kindergarten, 71% for first grade, and 77% for second grade. These percentages show that our students require strong Tier 1 supports and direct instruction in foundational reading skills (phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency) to continue to grow as readers.

Sabal Palm Elementary will implement a new Tier I literacy program focused on foundational reading skills called UFLI in all K-2 reading classrooms. This program is based on the Science of Reading and is designed to teach students how to read explicitly.

Continuing to invest in our primary grades will build a strong foundation in our students as they progress into the intermediate grades at Sabal Palm Elementary. Our goal is to instill confidence in all students at an early age so they can refine their reading skills as they learn to read more complex texts.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Based on our SY22-23 FAST PM data in grades 3-5, ELA was identified as a critical need. Our 3-5 reading proficiency data is as follows: 69% for third grade, 59% for fourth grade, and 45% for fifth grade. The sharp decline from our primary grades to our intermediate grades show the necessity to provide students with research-based interventions and remediation.

UFLI will also be utilized for the first year at Sabal Palm Elementary in grades 3-5 as the primary intervention for students. Additionally, teachers will remediate lessons using differentiated small-group instruction to collect data to support students.

By focusing on the critical ELA needs of our students, we can simultaneously address other areas of concern, such as the science curriculum, that are heavily impacted by a child's ability to read.

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Based on SY222-23 FAST PM 3 data, Sabal Palm Elementary will increase the amount of proficient Kindergarten students from 78% to 83% on the 23-24 FAST PM 3 assessment.

Based on SY222-23 FAST PM 3 data, Sabal Palm Elementary will increase the amount of proficient first grade students from 71% to 76% on the 23-24 FAST PM 3 assessment.

Based on SY222-23 FAST PM 3 data, Sabal Palm Elementary will increase the amount of proficient second grade students from 77% to 82% on the 23-24 FAST PM 3 assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on the SY222-23 FAST PM 3 data, Sabal Palm Elementary will increase the amount of proficient third grade students from 69% to 79% on the 23-24 FAST PM 3 assessment.

Based on the SY222-23 FAST PM 3 data, Sabal Palm Elementary will increase the amount of proficient fourth grade students from 59% to 69% on the 23-24 FAST PM 3 assessment.

Based on the SY222-23 FAST PM 3 data, Sabal Palm Elementary will increase the amount of proficient fifth grade students from 45% to 55% on the 23-24 FAST PM 3 assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Our school administration will monitor our UFLI instruction in grades K-5 (Tier I whole group in K-2 and small group remediation in 3-5). We will discuss implementation, lesson planning, and progress monitoring during Admin Common Planning. To monitor the fidelity of instruction and implementation, school administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs during designated UFLI teaching times and small group remediation.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Felts, Amber, feltsa@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The University of Florida Literacy Institute developed the UFLI program, founded on the Science of Reading. The Duval County Public Schools have adopted this program as a Tier I foundational literacy program for all K-2 classrooms and remediation in grades 3-5. It is incorporated into our district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan and aligned with B.E.S.T. ELA benchmarks for grades K-5.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Some elementary school students at Sabal Palm struggle with reading. They require direct instruction in fundamental reading skills so they can read and comprehend complex text. The UFLI program aims to

get students reading by developing their fundamental reading skills through intentionally designed lessons.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
All ELA teachers in grades K-5 will receive intensive training on the UFLI program's implementation. Teachers in grades K-2 will learn how to implement the program in large groups, while teachers in grades 3-5 will learn how to implement the program in small remedial groups.	O'Neal, Asia, oneala3@duvalschools.org
Teachers in grades K-2 will utilize UFLI as a Tier I core curriculum component.	Felts, Amber, feltsa@duvalschools.org
Teachers in grades 3 through 5 will analyze their beginning-of-year data to determine which students require small-group UFLI remediation.	O'Neal, Asia, oneala3@duvalschools.org
Teachers in grades 3 through 5 will implement UFLI in small groups while continuously monitoring student progress.	O'Neal, Asia, oneala3@duvalschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

N/A

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No