San Pablo Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

San Pablo Elementary School

801 18TH AVE N, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

http://www.duvalschools.org/sanpablo

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 6/23/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (77%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan 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 Pablo Elementary School

801 18TH AVE N, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

http://www.duvalschools.org/sanpablo

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	30%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

School Grades History

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

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brown, Jennifer	Principal	
Bryant, Johnny	Assistant Principal	
Jenkins, Beth	School Counselor	
Atlee, Whitney	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/23/2020, Jennifer Brown

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
31

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (77%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	93	73	74	83	73	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	463
Attendance below 90 percent	8	5	2	3	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	25	37	22	24	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	37	47	34	38	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160

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	24	32	20	21	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/7/2020

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	6	10	8	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	12	48	25	28	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
Students retained two or more times	6	25	39	47	52	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	221

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	6	10	8	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	12	48	25	28	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
Students retained two or more times	6	25	39	47	52	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	221

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	75%	50%	57%	77%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	75%	56%	58%	70%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	50%	53%	58%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	88%	62%	63%	87%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	78%	63%	62%	75%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	76%	52%	51%	66%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	82%	48%	53%	69%	50%	51%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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

MATH

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

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	82%	49%	33%	53%	29%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	88%	56%	32%	55%	33%
Same Grade Comparison	-6%					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	32	64	69	82	80	85	50				
ELL	55			73							
BLK	63	90		69	90						
HSP	63	81		83	81		55				
WHT	79	74	67	90	77	74	88				
FRL	65	64	53	80	70	79	65				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	41	32	27	64	50	42	50				
BLK	55	55		60	55						
HSP	78	63		87	74						
MUL	70			80							
WHT	78	60	47	91	69	66	91				
FRL	66	56	38	82	74	68	94				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	34	54	50	53	67	60	36				
ELL	55			73							
BLK	47	45		53	73						
HSP	70	85		87	92						
MUL	62	80		92	70						
WHT	81	71	55	90	75	63	73				
FRL	66	65	65	79	74	68	65				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	611
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	66
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	66
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	78
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	71
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	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	78
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	69
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.

N/A

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

3rd grade FSA ELA reading proficiency took a 9 percentage point decline.

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.

We were above the state average in every area.

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

An increase in learning gains and lowest quartile gains in the ELA categories for FSA. The actions that the school took for improving this area were administration and teachers identifying students at the beginning of the school year and monitoring academic growth each quarter and also identifying

their strengths and weaknesses in reading to adjust small differentiated reading groups in grades 3-5 ELA classes.

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

N/A

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

1. Improving 3rd grade FSA ELA Reading proficiency to above 70%.
2. Maintaining overall FSA ELA Reading proficiency above 75%
3. Maintaining overall FSA Math proficiency above 85%
4. Maintaining overall NGSSS Science proficiency above 80%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Going into the 2020-21, a main area of focus for San Pablo Elementary School will be maintaining overall school proficiency scores. Historically, proficiency in 3rd grade reading has fluctuated between 68-72%. We want to create consistency and begin with a minimum level of 70% proficiency and continue to build on that going forward.
Measurable Outcome:	San Pablo will focus on the overall 3rd grade ELA FSA Reading proficiency of 70%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Whole group classroom explicit instruction and gradual release model Small group teacher led instruction One on One instruction (intervention) Research Based Interventions that are appropriate to the individual student's area of focus
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies have been proven beneficial in the overall instruction and learning at San Pablo Elementary School and serves as the foundation for student growth and success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. In the classroom, teachers continue fluid small groups for reading based on iReady Reading diagnostic and growth check data and Achieve3000 lexiles and level set data (Tier 1). Follow district ELA curriculum guide recommendations.

2. VE teachers will continue to push in with students that they are servicing (Tier 2). Designated times during ELA instruction pull their students for a small pull out reading intervention session.

3. Implement small group reading pull outs using Phonics for Reading Curriculum for students whose baseline data indicates they are reading at a grade K or 1 level based on iReady Reading fall diagnostic (Tier 3)

Person Responsible	Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Creating and Aligning Assessments at each grade to promote student mastery of reading standards. This will happen in conjunction with the work we are continuing with Standards Alignment using Learning Arcs for planning, and for building greater understanding of the Standards. Through this collaborative work, we will continue to build teacher to teacher trust.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of Content Core teachers at each grade level will successfully engage in revamping and creating Assessments based on the Learning Arc and/or FSA style questions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher teams will revamp and create formative and summative assessments to mirror the level of grade level rigor found on the Florida State Assessments or on the Grade Level Standards. Teachers will use formative and summative assessments that will consist of exit tickets, quizzes, end of unit assessments, and looking at student work through teacher anecdotal notes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Creating and analyzing common assessments allows teachers to calibrate expectations for student performance across grade levels. Common grade level assessments deepen understanding of what is needed in order to track student mastery of standards in order to meet reading proficiency goals.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration will review the Learning Arc work that began last school year, to ensure understanding and to lay the foundation to begin to create aligned assessments.

Person Responsible Johnny Bryant (bryantj1@duvalschools.org)

In the First 9-weeks Administration will use the Walk-through tool to revisit task alignment to be certain that is still aligned.

Person Responsible Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will gather current assessments being used to determine which are already aligned, which ones need to be edited and which ones need to be abandoned.

Person Responsible Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)

Teachers and Leadership will collaborate to revise previous assessments and create assessments. This work will allow us to build a tool box of assessment questions across grade levels that will promote mastery. Item analysis of the assessments will help teachers plan for ongoing instruction and will assist in determining if the assessments are valid and reliable.

Person Responsible Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will work collaboratively to analyze student data after each assessment. This will allow them to determine and implement interventions, re-teaching and /or adjust the assessments as needed.

Person Responsible Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)

School Leadership will continue regular Walk-throughs and will use the data collected to monitor progress.

Person Responsible Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)

The PLC's will be led by the Principal and the Assistant Principal as we roll out this work. While the Administrative team will stay involved in the collaboration we will gradually release the leading of the meetings to the teachers. This will enable us to continue to build leadership capacity as well as build Teacher to Teacher Trust.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Other specifically relating to 5 Essentials/ Collaborative Teachers	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Building teacher to teacher trust through collaborative work that will happen during PLC and grade level common planning to build assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase by 10 points on the Teacher Trust Section of the 5Essential Survey in order to move out of the neutral category and into the strong category.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will work in grade level teams to foster collegiality through consistent collaboration. Teachers will work together to revamp and create Common Assessments across the grade level. This consistent collaboration enables teachers to build trust in each other.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our teacher teacher trust on 5 Essential survey increased but was still in the neutral zone based on the survey. When teachers work together toward a common goal and are engaged in the work, teacher to teacher trust is built.

Action Steps to Implement

This work will take place through the following options: PLC's, teacher common planning, district workshops/training, and other collaborative planning opportunities.

Person Responsible Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School leadership team will meet weekly to discuss, brainstorm, and plan specific next steps to review to roll out at our bi-weekly grade and subject level professional learning communities. As we focus on maintaining proficiency across grade levels, this will give us a more focused scope on how we teach grade level standards in order for our students to be successful at mastering them. Also this work will further assist in promoting more cohesion in teacher to teacher trust through PLC collaboration throughout the school year.

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 Pablo has many ways that it engages Stakeholders and maintains quality relationships with the community. San Pablo has an active PTA that meets regularly to discuss the vision for our school and ways that the PTA can support that vision and assist in promoting growth for all students and teachers. The PTA plans many off campus Spirit Nights for our families and local businesses to build relationships. We also have many events to encourage our families and the community to join us on campus, these include a Veteran's Day Celebration, Holiday Sing-Along, Book Fairs, Dances, Arts Nights and a Holiday Fair. We host a Beach Run each year to encourage our commitment to fitness and the community is invited to participate in the run. We have a quality SAC that meets monthly to discuss the state of the school and how the SAC can best serve our school community. We are associated with a Non Profit organization called the Friends of San Pablo that consistently seeks creative ways to support San Pablo Elementary. We have an active partnership with our Faith Based Partner that has benefited our school in many ways. In the Spring we have a group of Master Gardeners that volunteer for several weeks working specifically with out third graders. We also have retired educators that are regular volunteers at San Pablo. This school year we are seeking more opportunities to engage virtually with our community stakeholders to continue to allow them glimpses into our daily school experience.

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: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: 5 Essentials/ Collaborative Teachers	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00