

Duval County Public Schools

San Pablo Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

San Pablo Elementary School

801 18TH AVE N, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

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

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
2018-19 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (77%) 2014-15: A (73%)
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 Duval 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	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

San Pablo Elementary School

801 18TH AVE N, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

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

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 KG-5	No	32%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	21%

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 Duval 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.

Through rigorous, standards-based instruction and curriculum, as well as an engaging Science, Health and Fitness magnet program. San Pablo ensures student performance and the success of each learner.

Provide the school's vision statement.

San Pablo Elementary School is dedicated to providing a healthy, productive learning environment that nurtures the academic, physical, and social growth of all students.

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
Manabat, Stephanie	Principal	
Bryant, Johnny	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	81	72	79	81	72	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	464
Attendance below 90 percent	6	4	7	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	7	16	27	23	29	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122

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	3	6	10	8	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	12	48	25	28	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
Students retained two or more times	6	25	39	47	52	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	221

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/31/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

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	15	16	13	12	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	6	2	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	28	41	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	6	17	24	10	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	75%	50%	57%	77%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	75%	56%	58%	70%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	50%	53%	58%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	88%	62%	63%	87%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	78%	63%	62%	75%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	76%	52%	51%	66%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	82%	48%	53%	69%	50%	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	81 (0)	72 (0)	79 (0)	81 (0)	72 (0)	79 (0)	464 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	6 ()	4 ()	7 ()	9 ()	3 ()	0 ()	29 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 ()	2 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	8 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	7 ()	16 (0)	27 (0)	23 (0)	29 (0)	20 (0)	122 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

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	68%	51%	17%	58%	10%
	2018	77%	50%	27%	57%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	52%	17%	58%	11%
	2018	70%	49%	21%	56%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	84%	50%	34%	56%	28%
	2018	82%	51%	31%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	92%	61%	31%	62%	30%
	2018	84%	59%	25%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	64%	15%	64%	15%
	2018	87%	60%	27%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	90%	57%	33%	60%	30%
	2018	91%	61%	30%	61%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	82%	49%	33%	53%	29%
	2018	88%	56%	32%	55%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	32	64	69	82	80	85	50				
ELL	55			73							
BLK	63	90		69	90						
HSP	63	81		83	81		55				
WHT	79	74	67	90	77	74	88				
FRL	65	64	53	80	70	79	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	41	32	27	64	50	42	50				
BLK	55	55		60	55						
HSP	78	63		87	74						
MUL	70			80							
WHT	78	60	47	91	69	66	91				
FRL	66	56	38	82	74	68	94				

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	34	54	50	53	67	60	36				
ELL	55			73							
BLK	47	45		53	73						
HSP	70	85		87	92						
MUL	62	80		92	70						
WHT	81	71	55	90	75	63	73				
FRL	66	65	65	79	74	68	65				

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	76
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	611
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	66
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	66
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	78
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	71
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	78
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	69
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.

NA

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

NA

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.

NA

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

An increase in learning gains and lowest quartile gains in the ELA categories for FSA. The actions that the school took for improving this area were administration and teachers identifying students at the beginning of the school year and monitoring their academic growth every quarter and also identifying their strengths and weaknesses in reading to adjust small learning differentiated groups.

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

NA

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

1. Maintaining learning gains in reading and math at 70% or higher
2. Maintaining lowest quartile learning gains in reading and math at 60% or higher
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Learning gains in reading and math
Rationale	The actions that the school took for improving this area were administration and teachers identifying students at the beginning of the school year and monitoring their academic growth every quarter and also identifying their strengths and weaknesses in reading and math to adjust small learning differentiated groups.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Maintaining learning gains in reading and math at 70% or higher
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephanie Manabat (manabats@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	MTS Leadershipship Team Monitoring PMA, iReady, and Achieve3000 data Reviewing student PMA, iReady, and Achieve3000 data during bi-weekly grade level meetings with teachers and MTS Leadership Team
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Student data will be monitored as relevant student data is available through data discussions bi-weekly and professional development opportunities during each quarter.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Standards Walk Through Observations by administration 2. Effective differentiated instruction centers in ELA and Math that address the needs of students 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Stephanie Manabat (manabats@duvalschools.org)

#2

Title	Lowest quartile learning gains in reading and math
Rationale	The actions that the school took for improving this area were administration and teachers identifying students at the beginning of the school year and monitoring their academic growth every quarter and also identifying their strengths and weaknesses in reading and math to adjust small learning differentiated groups.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Maintaining lowest performing quartile learning gains in reading and math at 60% or higher
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	MTS Leadershipship Team Monitoring PMA, iReady, and Achieve3000 data Reviewing student PMA, iReady, and Achieve3000 data during bi-weekly grade level meetings with teachers and MTS Leadership Team
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Student data will be monitored as relevant student data is available through data discussions bi-weekly and professional development opportunities during each quarter.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Standards Walk Through Observations by administration 2. Effective differentiated instruction centers in ELA and Math that address the needs of students 3. Teachers keep updated data notebook on lowest performing quartile students 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

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).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

NA

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

NA

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

NA

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

NA

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

NA

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Learning gains in reading and math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lowest quartile learning gains in reading and math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00