

Duval County Public Schools

# San Jose Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>20</b> |

# 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: 6/20/2020

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><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 |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (48%)<br>2017-18: C (50%)<br>2016-17: C (45%)<br>2015-16: D (36%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I  |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>20</b> |

# San Jose Elementary School

5805 SAINT AUGUSTINE RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

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

## School Demographics

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School<br/>PK-5</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>              | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>          | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">88%</p>                |

## School Grades History

|              |                |                |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>2019-20</b> | <b>2018-19</b> | <b>2017-18</b> | <b>2016-17</b> |
| <b>Grade</b> | C              | C              | C              | C              |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

At San Jose Elementary, we will empower students to become lifelong learners and responsible citizens.

**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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name               | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Gomez, Jasmin      | Principal           |   |
| Naylor, Rachel     | Assistant Principal |   |
| Crespo, Jennifer   | Instructional Coach |   |
| Geoghagan, Rebecca | Instructional Coach | Math coach was purchased using Title I funds to support math needs that range from weekly common planning, to model lessons, coaching cycles, and instructional feedback. |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Saturday 6/20/2020, Jasmin Gomez E

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

54

**Demographic Data**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><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 |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (48%)<br>2017-18: C (50%)<br>2016-17: C (45%)<br>2015-16: D (36%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

**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               | 118         | 115 | 142 | 110 | 119 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 713   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 22          | 29  | 3   | 20  | 14  | 24  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 112   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 1           | 1   | 4   | 0   | 5   | 2   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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 | 1           | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 6/17/2020

**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 |       |
| 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  |

**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  |
| 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  |

**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   |       |
|   | (0)                               | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (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.**

| 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%                    |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 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        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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.

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |      |
|---|------|
| 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% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>  |      |
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>   |      |
| 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%       | 0    |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>  |      |
| 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%        | 0    |
| <b>Native American Students</b>   |      |
| 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%         | 0    |
| <b>Asian Students</b>   |      |
| Federal Index - Asian Students  | 52   |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0    |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>  |      |
| 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%  | 0    |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students   | 53   |

| Hispanic Students  |     |
|--|-----|
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| 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%                | 0   |
| 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%           | 0   |
| 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%                      | 0   |
| 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% | 0   |

## 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 SWD subgroup showed the lowest performance in 2019 for both reading and math proficiency. Our SWD subgroup has consistently been a low performing group. One concern is the mobility of our SWD population. This subgroup is constantly gaining new members that move into our school and losing students that are moving out of the area. The lack of stability contributes to the group's low performance. A second concern is the teachers' knowledge of a variety of interventions. Both ESE teachers attended training on a variety of strategies to help build their toolbox of interventions. ESE students also received targeted support through the Corrective Reading intervention program and implementation of Acaletics for math support.

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

The greatest decline in 2019 was reading and math proficiency for our white subgroup. Many small group interventions were targeted to LPQ students and did not effectively support students that were previously proficient or moving towards proficiency. ELL students also received additional interventions in reading provided by ESOL paraprofessional support. To address this decline, all students in K-2 will receive direct instruction in reading through the Reading Mastery program. Students in 3-5 will also receive targeted support through the Corrective Reading program. ELL newcomers will receive support through the Language for Learners program. For math, students in K-1 will receive additional support through differentiated math centers. Grades 2 -5 will receive direct support through the Acaletics program.

**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.**

The FSA Reading proficiency data for 3rd grade students is 29% below the state average. Curriculum changes over the past few years resulted in this group of students not receiving primary phonic instruction which attributed to this increased gap in reading proficiency. This group of students is compromised of 48% ELL Learners which has also attributed to the lower reading proficiency. Another factor is that 13% of this group are students with disabilities. Corrective Reading and Language for Learners was implemented to address this gap.

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

4th Grade reading proficiency showed the most improvement. 4th grade Reading proficiency improved by 15% compared to the 2018 data. Work during common planning to focus on the item specifications and the depth of the standard helped to align instruction. Achieve 3000 and I-ready Reading were monitored closely, and AP worked with teachers to identify target students and have data chats to focus small group instruction. Top score writing was incorporated as a part of the curriculum to help support reading and writing skills. Corrective Reading was also used throughout the fourth grade to target areas of growth and further improve student reading skills

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Being a school in the lowest 300 in the state, our largest area of concern is the number of students scoring a level 1 on FSA Reading. To address this concern, we have implemented a school-wide reading intervention program. Students in grades K-2 receive targeted support through the Reading Mastery intervention program. Students in grades 3-5 receive targeted support through the Corrective Reading program. ELL newcomer students in grades K-5 receive support through the Language for Learners program. Reading Interventionists and Reading Coach support the implementation of the direct instruction program as well as leading additional groups to ensure small group size.

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

1. Level 1s on the FSA
2. Interventions for students with disabilities and lowest 25%
3. Attendance

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on data, more than half of students are performing below proficiency in all core subjects (ELA/Math/Science) and in need of targeted standards based instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:** If teachers increase the use of standards aligned tasks, then student proficiency will increase by in math, reading and science.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jasmin Gomez (esparzaj@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** San Jose Elementary will commit to generating standards aligned tasks by engaging in unpacking standards, item specifications and achievement level descriptors (ALDs). Evidence will include the Standards Based Walkthrough Tool data, student work, etc.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Standards-based aligned student tasks will lead to an increase of academic proficiency in all content areas.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Action Step #1- Admin and instructional coaches will meet with each grade level team weekly during collaborative planning time to plan standards based aligned student tasks.

1. Admin and coaches will plan and facilitate weekly common planning sessions among grade level teams.
2. Admin and coaches will provide a plethora of research-based resources for teachers to generate aligned student tasks.
3. Admin, instructional coaches, Math Interventionist and Reading Interventionists will collaborate with teachers to develop aligned student tasks.
4. Admin, instructional coaches, Math Interventionist and Reading Interventionists will provide intensive support to students far below grade level through targeted intervention support coupled with standards based small group instruction. This is an opportunity for admin, instructional coaches, Math Interventionist and Reading Interventionists to model small group instruction for teachers using aligned student tasks.

Strategy #2 Action Steps: #2- Admin and instructional coaches will conduct instructional rounds using the Standards Based Walkthrough tool to calibrate within the first month of school. Following months, leadership team will conduct bi-monthly walkthroughs to assess aligned student tasks.

1. Admin and instructional coaches will conduct weekly walkthroughs to follow through with goals from common planning and monitor aligned student tasks.
2. Admin and instructional coaches will utilize the Standards Based Walkthrough tool.
3. Admin and instructional coaches will provide consistent feedback to teachers on delivering effective standards based instruction and the use of aligned student tasks.

Strategy #3 Action Steps: Admin and instructional coaches will lead standards based instruction trainings and facilitate data chats to implement aligned student tasks.

1. Provide professional development opportunities for teachers gather a variety of data sources and making data informed decisions when grouping students.
2. Provide professional development opportunities for teachers for developing reading, math and science aligned student tasks.
3. Provide professional development on the utilization of additional instructional resources and technology resources to provide differentiated aligned student tasks.



**Person Responsible** Jasmin Gomez (esparzaj@duvalschools.org)

Strategy #4 Action Steps- #4- Admin and instructional coaches will provide opportunities during the school day for teachers to observe each other's instruction and discuss aligned student tasks. .

1. Teachers will participate in instructional rounds to examine standards and student tasks being given within their same grade level.
2. Teachers will also observe teachers in the grade level below and grade level above to examine progression of standards and engage in vertical articulation around standards and student tasks.

**Person Responsible** Jasmin Gomez (esparzaj@duvalschools.org)

Admin and instructional coaches will provide teachers with site licenses, additional instructional resources, technology and other outside resources to extend and enhance students' connections between academic lessons and real world experiences (off-campus learning field trips related to curriculum). These additional resources will provide an FSA equivalent experience and expose students to standards based aligned tasks.

Reading Interventionists, math interventionist, and 5th grade teacher will provide targeted standards based instruction in small group support to students needing additional differentiated student tasks. An emphasis will be placed on lowest performing quartile and below grade level students.

**Person Responsible** Jasmin Gomez (esparzaj@duvalschools.org)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** This area of focus will serve as the foundation for providing students with the social emotional learning to needed to support their overall mental health like being able to regulate their emotions and positive social skills. Students that can regulate their emotions perform at higher levels than students that cannot. At San Jose, our mission is to empower students to be responsible citizens. By implementing character education, we will be able to strive towards reaching academic achievement for ALL students.

**Measurable Outcome:** If teachers implement social emotional learning and school-wide positive behavior systems with fidelity, then students will become responsible citizens.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Implement Positive Behavior Systems using daily Morning Meeting using Sanford Harmony (SEL curriculum) and Calm Classroom

Implement Positive Behavior Systems using Panda Paws  
 Implement Positive Behavior Systems using Positive Panda Referrals aligned to character traits of the month  
 Implement Positive Behavior Systems by having a Calm Down Area in every classroom to be proactive with addressing negative student behavior

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** More than ever, social emotional learning is necessary in schools to address the learning gaps caused by home learning and meet the variety of student needs during this pandemic.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Admin and School Counselor will provide professional development opportunities to teachers on implementation of a Morning Meeting using Sanford Harmony, Calm Classroom, and character building lessons. If funding allows, Parent Liaison will be used to bridge gap between school and home to provide opportunities for families to learn about Sanford Harmony and Calm Classroom to implement strategies at home. Parent Liaison will host family workshops to provide emotional regulation support to families to apply with students at home. Parent liaison will communicate 'positive glows' with families for students that are struggling with behavior.

**Person Responsible** Rachel Naylor (naylor@duvalschools.org)

Admin will provide professional development to all teachers and staff on the use of Panda Paws to reward desired behaviors in common areas; Admin and School Counselor will provide professional development to all teachers and staff on the use of Positive Panda Referrals to reward desired behaviors in and out of the classroom.

**Person Responsible** Rachel Naylor (naylor@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will implement a calm down area in all classrooms. Teachers will provide calm down bins that include a variety of resources to assist students with regulating their emotions.

**Person Responsible** Rachel Naylor (naylor@duvalschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**We will also place an emphasis to addressing our ESSA data to target our ESE population and Black students. We must provide incentive PD to our VE teachers to provide additional tiers of quality support to our ESE students. Our VE teachers will also be provided with an opportunity to engage in planning with the admin team to review the content being covered in their grade levels. VE teachers will be expected to supplement the grade level course work that is being done in the classroom while also providing scaffolds and intensive supports to differentiate the learning. As a leadership team, we will also engage in close monitoring of black students and their data to identify the root causes as they occur to engage in problem solving immediately. A team of teaches are engaging in an 'equity book study' to examine this further in our school and find strategies that will ensure that we are addressing our ESSA data.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

San Jose uses a variety of strategies to ensure a positive school environment. Every classroom participates in the Sanford Harmony social emotional learning program that utilizes morning meetings, skills lessons and relationship building activities to promote a positive classroom culture. Each classroom also has a buddy classroom to build relationships and community throughout the building. Each classroom also recognizes a Student of the Month that has exemplified the positive behavior expectations for that month.

The San Jose PBIS team has established procedures and expectations that help promote a positive school culture. The PBIS team created behavior expectations for all common spaces that encourage students to be Respectful, Responsible and Safe. The PBIS team meets monthly to discuss next steps for positive behavior support at San Jose. Members of the PBIS team also led a book study this year on the book, *Equity Audits in the Classroom*, to support teacher professional growth. As a part of the book study, the authors came and spoke with the group about the information and professional growth that was inspired by the text.

To involve all stakeholders, San Jose has incorporated a variety of communication methods and activities. Teachers and staff at San Jose used Class Dojo to communicate with parents throughout the year. Class Dojo allows parents to receive individual messages about student progress, updates on school activities and to communicate directly with the teacher. Class Dojo offers parents the opportunity to translate all messages into their preferred language allowing for clear communication with all stakeholders. San Jose also has a strong social media presence that is utilized to communicate with all stakeholders. San Jose also has a team of bilingual paraprofessionals and staff that help communicate with our diverse community to

ensure all families are able to support their students' learning.

San Jose also hosted several parent and community engagement activities. One of our Faith-based partners hosted a free BBQ and Books back to school bash to welcome families to San Jose. Each grade level also invited parents to come to a Data Night to learn about student data and strategies to help students at home. Students and parents were also invited to a Reading Night that encouraged students to complete different reading activities to get their "passports" stamped as they read around the world. Two of our Faith-based partners worked on beautification projects volunteering time, labor and resources to improve our campus. The local Rotary club has also partnered with San Jose to support some of our families with food and financial needs.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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

**Part V: Budget**

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

|               |        |  |               |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1             | III.A. | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction</b> | <b>\$0.00</b> |
| 2             | III.A. | <b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Social Emotional Learning</b>  | <b>\$0.00</b> |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |  | <b>\$0.00</b> |