

Duval County Public Schools

San Jose Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	11
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	15

San Jose Elementary School

5805 SAINT AUGUSTINE RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

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

Demographics

Principal: Paula Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: C
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: D 2014-15: D 2013-14: D
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	

Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

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

Provide the school's vision statement

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smith, Paula	Principal	
Naylor, Rachel	Assistant Principal	
Crespo, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Geoghagan, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	105	141	106	137	119	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	717
Attendance below 90 percent	20	20	27	10	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	5	20	10	8	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	51	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	5	3	0	13	65	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

41

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	37%	50%	57%	36%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	58%	51%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	50%	53%	51%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	48%	62%	63%	55%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	62%	63%	62%	62%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	52%	51%	52%	48%	47%
Science Achievement	34%	48%	53%	46%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	105 (0)	141 (0)	106 (0)	137 (0)	119 (0)	109 (0)	717 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	20 ()	20 ()	27 ()	10 ()	5 ()	2 ()	84 (0)
One or more suspensions	5 ()	20 (0)	10 (0)	8 (0)	15 (0)	10 (0)	68 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	13 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	13 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (0)	51 (0)	40 (0)	101 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	29%	51%	-22%	58%	-29%
	2018	36%	50%	-14%	57%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
	2018	29%	49%	-20%	56%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	30%	50%	-20%	56%	-26%
	2018	28%	51%	-23%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

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

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

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
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				

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

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 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
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
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

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

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

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

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Reading Proficiency
Rationale	Only 37% of our student are reading on grade level with only one percentage gain from 2018 to 2019.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to increase our proficiency to 45% (an increase of +8 points)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Paula Smith (smithp10@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>A Reading Coach will be position will be used for reading achievement progress by leading PLC groups for strategic weekly planning, modeling and co-teaching to improve instructional practice as well as provide professional development and consistent coaching for teachers.</p> <p>Two Reading Interventionists will be purchased to implement targeted groups in K - 5th grade for tier II intervention during grade level RTI blocks schoolwide.</p> <p>Materials will be purchased to support lowest performing quartile students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades Materials include but are not limited to Reading Mastery Signature Edition, Corrective Reading, LLI kits, and Benchmark Solucions (Spanish Language Arts).</p> <p>Site Licenses for Teacher Memberships for VocabularySpellingcity.com to support our high needs of language acquisition</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Due to our large percentage of ELL learners (48%), language acquisition with emphasis on vocabulary and word analysis
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementation of RSME in Kinder, 1st and 2nd grade for reading foundational skills of phonics, phonemes, and phonemic awareness to develop oral skills. 2. Implementation of Corrective Reading in 3rd grade and 4th & 5th LPQ students to develop comprehension through word analysis and vocabulary 3. Progress monitoring through weekly reading records and other informal and formal assessments such as district PMAs 4. Implementation of Writing City for K - 3rd grades and Top Score Writing for 4th & 5th grades to develop literacy through writing and grammar 5. Strategic RTI blocks per grade level to provide specific intervention to develop fluency and comprehension
Person Responsible	Rachel Naylor (naylorr@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	ESSA subgroup of Black students
Rationale	only 40% of Black students are meeting the target improvement for proficiency; There was an increase of +1 point but its only 26% Reading on grade level.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will improve our Black students percent proficient to 42%, a 18 point gain.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jennifer Crespo (crespoj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Daily small group instruction with targeted group with interventionist and Reading teacher to provide both differentiated skills deficits instruction and scaffolded grade level standards work through guided reading.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher-led small group guided instruction allows for explicit instruction for skills and standards needs.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Baseline assessment of placement test for Direct instruction curriculum 2. Multiple sessions per week of guided reading with grade level text 3. Daily sessions of Direct Instruction skills sessions to build foundational strategies 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Crespo (crespoj@duvalschools.org)

#3	
Title	ESSA subgroup of SWD students
Rationale	Only 12% of ESE students were proficient and a decline of -12 points from previous year's results. There were 41% to make learning gains
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will increase our level of proficient students of SWD to 25% to double our current
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rachel Naylor (naylorr@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	VE Teacher will also be trained on specific Direct Instruction curriculum to assure SWD students are receiving targeted instruction in deficit skills
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	VE teacher and Reading teacher will provide daily small group instruction to support learning targets for SWD students
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Baseline assessment for homogenous small groupings 2. Daily intervention with Direct Instruction for foundational skills 3. Exposure to grade level standard work through guided reading sessions multiple times per week 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

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

Part IV: Title I Requirements

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

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

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

PFEP Link

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part V: Budget

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