# San Jose Elementary School



# 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# San Jose Elementary School

## 5805 SAINT AUGUSTINE RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

### http://www.duvalschools.org/sanjose

## Demographics

## Principal: Jasmin Gomez E

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2019

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (48%)<br><br>2017-18: C (50%)<br><br>2016-17: C (45%)<br><br>2015-16: D (36%)<br><br>2014-15: D (35%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Cassandra Brusca |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |

| ESSA Status | TS&I |
|---|---|
| * 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

## San Jose Elementary School

### 5805 SAINT AUGUSTINE RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

### http://www.duvalschools.org/sanjose

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2018-19 Title I School** | **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5 | Yes | 100% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 88% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | C | C | C | D |

## 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.**

At San Jose Elementary, we will empower students to become lifelong learners and responsible citizens. Teach little Readers to become future leaders.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

At San Jose Elementary, we believe that all children can learn. No children will be left behind. No exceptions. No excuses.

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Findlay, Paula | Principal | |
| Naylor, Rachel | Assistant Principal | |
| Crespo, Jennifer | Instructional Coach | |
| Geoghagan, Rebecca | Instructional Coach | |

## 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 | 105 | 141 | 106 | 137 | 119 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 717 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 20 | 20 | 27 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 |
| One or more suspensions | 5 | 20 | 10 | 8 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 51 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 |

**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 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 65 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**
41

**Date this data was collected or last updated**
Thursday 8/29/2019

## 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

## 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 | 37% | 50% | 57% | 27% | 49% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 51% | 56% | 58% | 46% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 47% | 50% | 53% | 54% | 54% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 48% | 62% | 63% | 48% | 62% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 62% | 63% | 62% | 58% | 63% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 57% | 52% | 51% | 46% | 54% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 34% | 48% | 53% | 37% | 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 | 105 (0) | 141 (0) | 106 (0) | 137 (0) | 119 (0) | 109 (0) | 717 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 20 () | 20 () | 27 () | 10 () | 5 () | 2 () | 84 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 5 () | 20 (0) | 10 (0) | 8 (0) | 15 (0) | 10 (0) | 68 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 13 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 13 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 10 (0) | 51 (0) | 40 (0) | 101 (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 | 29% | 51% | -22% | 58% | -29% |
| | 2018 | 36% | 50% | -14% | 57% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 44% | 52% | -8% | 58% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 29% | 49% | -20% | 56% | -27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 15% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 30% | 50% | -20% | 56% | -26% |
| | 2018 | 28% | 51% | -23% | 55% | -27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 41% | 61% | -20% | 62% | -21% |
| | 2018 | 57% | 59% | -2% | 62% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 57% | 64% | -7% | 64% | -7% |
| | 2018 | 51% | 60% | -9% | 62% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 38% | 57% | -19% | 60% | -22% |
| | 2018 | 44% | 61% | -17% | 61% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -13% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 29% | 49% | -20% | 53% | -24% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 56% | -16% | 55% | -15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 12 | 41 | 42 | 21 | 60 | 62 | 18 | | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 47 | 43 | 47 | 65 | 58 | 24 | | | | |
| ASN | 43 | 57 | | 57 | 72 | | 21 | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | 32 | 33 | 38 | 53 | 58 | 25 | | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 56 | 50 | 53 | 64 | 62 | 39 | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | 62 | | 40 | 55 | | 47 | | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 47 | 38 | 43 | 61 | 60 | 28 | | | | |
| 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 | 23 | 52 | 50 | 30 | 50 | 40 | 36 | | | | |
| ELL | 25 | 52 | 48 | 52 | 60 | 58 | 35 | | | | |
| ASN | 32 | 62 | 70 | 53 | 59 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 34 | 30 | 41 | 55 | 43 | 35 | | | | |
| HSP | 34 | 54 | 43 | 60 | 68 | 62 | 50 | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| WHT | 58 | 63 |  | 59 | 55 | 40 | 64 |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 34 | 49 | 49 | 53 | 61 | 50 | 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 | 11 | 38 | 45 | 32 | 56 |  | 25 |  |  |  |  |
| ELL | 10 | 34 | 47 | 43 | 55 | 51 | 13 |  |  |  |  |
| ASN | 22 | 34 | 42 | 50 | 59 |  | 38 |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 26 | 55 | 67 | 41 | 53 | 40 | 41 |  |  |  |  |
| HSP | 27 | 47 | 57 | 49 | 59 | 52 | 40 |  |  |  |  |
| MUL | 36 |  |  | 57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 33 | 50 |  | 54 | 69 |  | 33 |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 23 | 44 | 49 | 44 | 56 | 47 | 33 |  |  |  |  |

## 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) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 50 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 60 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 396 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 47 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 40 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 53 |
| 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 | 50 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Pacific Islander Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| White Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - White Students | 50 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 46 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

## Analysis

### Data 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.**

SWD is the lowest for all 3 content and the concern is the fidelity of the small group instruction of VE teacher; Skill of VE teacher to instruct on grade level content for push-in support for student needs.

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

Largest decline in white students in reading, science and math proficiency. Factor of small group instruction focused on LPQs or bubble students, not supporting those on grade level or proficient.

**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.**

3rd grade Reading has largest gap at -24%; There were huge curriculum gaps in Reading where this grade level did not have phonics for a year and then transitioned between 2 core curriculum within past 3 years.

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

4th grade Reading improved by 15% for grade level comparison and cohort comparison of 8% growth. Top Score writing was new element to integrate writing and reading and several students had 2 years of Phonics for Reading.

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

Attendance rate 24% of population is here less 90% present.

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

1. Reading Intervention of RMSE & Corrective to close gaps in K - 5
2. Small group instruction that is strategic and differentiated
3. Acaletics for grade level content math via standards
4. Students discourse with deeper level of collaboration of specific protocols
5.

# Part III: Planning for Improvement

## Areas of Focus:

| #1 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Reading Proficiency |
| **Rationale** | Only 37% of our student are reading on grade level with only one percentage gain from 2018 to 2019. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | We plan to increase our proficiency to 45% (an increase of +8 points) |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Paula Findlay (smithp10@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | A Reading Coach will be position will be used for reading achievement progress by leading PLC groups for strategic weekly planning, modeling and co-teaching to improve instructional practice as well as provide professional development and consistent coaching for teachers.<br>Two Reading Interventionists will be purchased to implement targeted groups in K - 5th grade for tier II intervention during grade level RTI blocks schoolwide.<br>Materials will be purchased to support lowest performing quartile students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades Materials include but are not limited to Reading Mastery Signature Edition, Corrective Reading, LLI kits, and Benchmark Solucions (Spanish Language Arts).<br>Site Licenses for Teacher Memberships for VocabularySpellingcity.com to support our high needs of language acquisition |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | Due to our large percentage of ELL learners (48%), language acquisition with emphasis on vocabulary and word analysis |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | 1. Implementation of RSME in Kinder, 1st and 2nd grade for reading foundational skills of phonics, phonemes, and phonemic awareness to develop oral skills.<br>2. Implementation of Corrective Reading in 3rd grade and 4th & 5th LPQ students to develop comprehension through word analysis and vocabulary<br>3. Progress monitoring through weekly reading records and other informal and formal assessments such as district PMAs<br>4. Implementation of Writing City for K - 3rd grades and Top Score Writing for 4th & 5th grades to develop literacy through writing and grammar<br>5. Strategic RTI blocks per grade level to provide specific intervention to develop fluency and comprehension |
| **Person Responsible** | Rachel Naylor (naylorr@duvalschools.org) |

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | ESSA subgroup of Black students |
| **Rationale** | only 40% of Black students are meeting the target improvement for proficiency; There was an increase of +1 point but its only 26% Reading on grade level. |
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | We will improve our Black students percent proficient to 42%, a 18 point gain. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Jennifer Crespo (crespoj@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Daily small group instruction with targeted group with interventionist and Reading teacher to provide both differentiated skills deficits instruction and scaffolded grade level standards work through guided reading. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | Teacher-led small group guided instruction allows for explicit instruction for skills and standards needs. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Baseline assessment of placement test for Direct instruction curriculum<br>2. Multiple sessions per week of guided reading with grade level text<br>3. Daily sessions of Direct Instruction skills sessions to build foundational strategies<br>4.<br>5. |
| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Crespo (crespoj@duvalschools.org) |

| #3 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | ESSA subgroup of SWD students |
| **Rationale** | Only 12% of ESE students were proficient and a decline of -12 points from previous year's results. There were 41% to make learning gains |
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | We will increase our level of proficient students of SWD to 25% to double our current |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Rachel Naylor (naylorr@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | VE Teacher will also be trained on specific Direct Instruction curriculum to assure SWD students are receiving targeted instruction in deficit skills |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | VE teacher and Reading teacher will provide daily small group instruction to support learning targets for SWD students |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Baseline assessment for homogenous small groupings<br>2. Daily intervention with Direct Instruction for foundational skills<br>3. Exposure to grade level standard work through guided reading sessions multiple times per week<br>4.<br>5. |
| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |

**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).**

We will implement Reading Intervention block for K - 5 with Direct Instruction materials to address foundational skills in K -2 as well as vocabulary and comprehension grade level text in various genres. We will also build on literacy skills with Top Score writing for 4th and 5th and Writing City for K - 3rd to incorporate analysis of text and written responses.

## 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.**

Monthly parent events that range from specifics of individual students data via grade levels to content area focus of strategies to support literacy, math and science. Continue partnership with quarterly events with Faith-based church partners such as Back to school BBQ and free books.

**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.**

Every classroom implement Sanford Harmony morning and buddy up events every day. There will also be quarterly events with primary and intermediate classes collaborating on events to build commradery vertically across grade levels.

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

Neighboring VPK programs visit our school and support tours to allow acclimation to our school. Our 5th graders visit partner Dual Language Middle school to promote continuuation of program. Middle school counselors also visit 5th graders to offer various programs at their schools.

**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.**

Leadership team meets weekly to assess progress monitoring of various groups of students and make adjustments to assure needs are being met.

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

Through schoolwide events such as World of Nations and Day of the Arts, students at all grade levels are exposed to a variety of opportunities for college and career readiness.

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | **Areas of Focus: Reading Proficiency** | $0.00 |
|---|--------|------------------------------------------|-------|
| 2 | III.A. | **Areas of Focus: ESSA subgroup of Black students** | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | **Areas of Focus: ESSA subgroup of SWD students** | $0.00 |
| | | **Total:** | $0.00 |