San Jose Elementary School

2020-21 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: 6/20/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (36%)
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 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.

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 (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

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

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	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

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (36%)
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](#).	

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.

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
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 profiency 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 vertifical articulation around standards and student tasks.

Person Responsible   Jasmin Gomez (esparzaj@duvalschools.org)

Admin and instructional coaches will provide teachers with site licenses, addiitonal 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 addiitonal dfferentiated 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 (naylorr@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 (naylorr@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 (naylorr@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.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00