Palencia Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Palencia Elementary School

355 PALENCIA VILLAGE DR, St. Augustine, FL 32095

http://www-pes.stjohns.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Catherine Goodrich

Start Date for this Principal: 1/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	15%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (62%) 2014-15: A (74%)
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 was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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

Palencia Elementary School

355 PALENCIA VILLAGE DR, St. Augustine, FL 32095

http://www-pes.stjohns.k12.fl.us/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	11%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	19%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

"We are a CREW setting SAIL into Tomorrow's world."

Included in this are the Key words CREW and SAIL, which stand for:

C- Creative S- Successful
R- Responsible A- Adventurous
E- Engaged I - Innovative
W - Worthy L- Leaders

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our School Vision is very simple: 100%

100% to us means that we strive to be a school where ALL (100%) of our students are achieving the required level of proficiency.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Goodrich, Catherine	Principal	Principal: At Palencia Elementary, the principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities, as well as participating on the RtI team. The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards. Assistant Principal: The assistant principal at Palencia Elementary also provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities, and also participates on the RtI team. Instructional Coach: Palencia Elementary's Instructional Literacy Coach develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/ behavior assessment and intervention approaches. The coach identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children. Teacher: The teachers serve a valuable role in the Leadership of the school. They provide valuable information as to the current condition of the school and the needs of the students. They often provide suggestions as to resolving instructional issues. The teachers are the most important aspect of the school.
Kerekes, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	
Hackney, Sharon	Teacher, K-12	
Worthington, Hali	Teacher, K-12	
Echevarria, Tatiana	Teacher, K-12	
Kirby, Kim	Teacher, ESE	
Dowdie, Kate	Teacher, K-12	
Craig, Alison	Teacher, K-12	

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Paciotti, Haleh	Instructional Coach	
Holtz, Audrey	Assistant Principal	

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	125	159	143	133	139	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	827
Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	3	7	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
50

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/27/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	11	9	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	11	9	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	81%	75%	57%	74%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	77%	67%	58%	64%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	59%	53%	55%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	83%	77%	63%	80%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	78%	69%	62%	76%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	59%	51%	64%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	72%	53%	73%	69%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	125 (0)	159 (0)	143 (0)	133 (0)	139 (0)	128 (0)	827 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	4 (4)	8 (8)	3 (11)	7 (9)	4 (9)	13 (14)	39 (55)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	1 (0)	0 (1)	1 (2)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (1)	3 (2)	6 (3)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (4)	7 (8)	11 (12)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	79%	78%	1%	58%	21%
	2018	85%	78%	7%	57%	28%
Same Grade Comparison	-6%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	77%	12%	58%	31%
	2018	75%	74%	1%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison	14%					
Cohort Comparison	4%					
05	2019	79%	76%	3%	56%	23%
	2018	70%	73%	-3%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison	9%					
Cohort Comparison	4%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	83%	82%	1%	62%	21%
	2018	78%	80%	-2%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison	5%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	87%	82%	5%	64%	23%
	2018	84%	83%	1%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison	3%					
Cohort Comparison	9%					
05	2019	83%	80%	3%	60%	23%
	2018	75%	79%	-4%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison	8%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	76%	73%	3%	53%	23%
	2018	56%	73%	-17%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
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	59	57	38	59	58	36	43				
ELL	45			64							
ASN	81	67		85	88		82				
BLK	69			77							
HSP	74	79	70	79	76		75				
WHT	82	76	65	84	79	58	76				
FRL	53	52	38	64	66	40	63				

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	52	51	48	54	64	49	28				
ASN	91	81		87	82						
HSP	64	62	60	76	74	75	27				
WHT	78	65	52	79	70	61	58				
FRL	61	48	54	63	73	61	43				

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	51	53	35	55	63	50	22				
ASN	86	83		86	92						
HSP	68	80		73	85		50				
MUL	73			73							
WHT	74	60	50	81	74	61	76				
FRL	62	60	48	63	64	52	52				

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	74
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	520
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

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	55
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	81
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	73
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	76
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	74
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The data component showing the lowest performance is our lowest 25% in Math. Unfortunately, there is a trend.
2017 - 64% made learning gains
2018 - 62% made learning gains
2019 - 59% made learning gains

Contributing factors include: new teachers to the profession and new teachers to the grade level, new ESE support facilitation teachers, need to identify specific gaps in learning and remediate appropriately

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

3rd grade ELA proficiency declined 6 percentage points in 2019. In 2018, 85% of our 3rd graders demonstrated proficiency. in 2019, 79% of our 3rd graders demonstrated proficiency.

Contributing factors include: new ESE support facilitation teacher, and the need to sync up common understanding of standards, the level of rigor, and what mastery of ELA standards look like through student work

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.

All of Palencia Elementary's data components are above state averages. However both 5th grade ELA and 5th grade Math proficiency demonstrate the narrowest margin between state averages. 5th grade ELA is 15% above the state average and 5th grade Math is 14% above state average.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is 5th grade Science proficiency, increasing by 20% from 55% in 2018 to 75% in 2019.

4th grade ELA proficiency also increased by a substantial amount -14%. (75% in 2018 to 89% in 2019)

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance below 90% across grade levels

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

1. Learning Gains for the lowest 25% in 5th grade Math
2. Percentage of proficiency in 3rd grade ELA
3. Emphasis on solid reading instruction K-2nd grade and closing reading gaps
4. Learning Gains in ELA and Math for SWD in the lowest 25%
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Learning Gains of Lowest 25% in ELA
Rationale	These are our neediest students. This area of focus is also in line with our superintendent's district goals.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	FSA ELA lowest quartile's learning gains will increase from 67% to 69%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Catherine Goodrich (catherine.goodrich@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Through the PLC process, grade level teams will identify and remediate the lowest 30%'s specific areas of deficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Weekly, PLC teams meet for 60 minutes to solidify core instruction, develop common assessments, review data, and form remediation groups. Two paraprofessionals are trained in and deliver SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words) as an intervention when appropriate. Our core RtI team meets weekly and routinely monitors growth of the school's lowest 25%.

Action Step	
Description	1. Identify essential standards 2. Identify specific pre-requisite skills needed for essential standard acquisition 3. Remediate deficiencies (outside of core instruction time) 4. Teams and RtI core team monitor progress monitoring data and report card grades 5. ESE teachers are included in all aforementioned steps
Person Responsible	Audrey Holtz (audrey.holtz@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Learning Gains of Lowest 25% in Math
Rationale	These are our neediest students. This area of focus is also in line with our superintendent's district goals.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	FSA Math lowest quartile's learning gains will increase from 59% to 64%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Catherine Goodrich (catherine.goodrich@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Through the PLC process, grade level teams will identify and remediate the lowest 30%'s specific areas of deficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Weekly, PLC teams meet for 60 minutes to solidify core instruction, develop common assessments, review data, and form remediation groups. Our core RtI team meets weekly and routinely monitors growth of the school's lowest 25%.

Action Step	
Description	1. Identify essential standards 2. Identify specific pre-requisite skills needed for essential standard acquisition 3. Remediate deficiencies (outside of core instruction time) 4. Teams and RtI core team monitor progress monitoring data and report card grades 5. ESE teachers are included in all aforementioned steps 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Audrey Holtz (audrey.holtz@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	School-wide Character Development
Rationale	The St. Johns County School District will inspire good character and a passion for lifelong learning in all students, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Office referrals will decrease by 3% from the 2018-2019 school year. Monthly, the school will publicly recognize specific students for specific actions demonstrating Character Counts! pillars in action.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Catherine Goodrich (catherine.goodrich@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Led by our school counselor, Tiffany Ellis, teachers and staff recognize students demonstrating positive behaviors.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Reinforcement and recognition of behaviors yields pride, self acknowledgment of one's actions, and likely repetition of behaviors demonstrating exemplary character traits.

Action Step	
Description	1. Ensure staff are trained in school-wide behavior plan 2. Schedule news show appearances and recognition ceremonies 3. Reward students - stating specific behaviors and why these behaviors are desirable 4. Publicize to the school community through the school newsletter, The Pirate Post 5.
Person Responsible	Audrey Holtz (audrey.holtz@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).