San Mateo Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

San Mateo Elementary School

600 BAISDEN RD, Jacksonville, FL 32218

http://www.duvalschools.org/sanmateo

Demographics

Principal: Caroline Wells L

Start Date for this Principal: 8/22/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

San Mateo Elementary School

600 BAISDEN RD, Jacksonville, FL 32218

http://www.duvalschools.org/sanmateo

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	72%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

San Mateo Accelerated Academy fosters academic excellence for all students emphasizing basic subjects, enrichment, and real life experiences. We believe this foundation prepares students for success in advanced studies.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of San Mateo Elementary is to empower students to reach their highest potential, develop a love of learning, and create socially responsible and productive citizens.

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
Wells, Caroline	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making with literacy and math, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.
Thomas , Shaakera	Assistant Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision-making with literacy and math, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.
Poag, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	- Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/ intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.
Mendoza, Guadalupe	School Counselor	Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; link community agencies to schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success; provides consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators; provides group and individual student interventions; and conducts direct observation of student behavior.Provides information about school wide and class wide behavior curriculum and instruction; participates in behavioral data collection; provides professional development.
Erickson, Erin	Teacher, K-12	- Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/ intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.
Rush, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/ intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

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	86	103	97	107	87	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	585
Attendance below 90 percent	5	8	7	8	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	

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	1	2	4	13	13	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

31

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/22/2019

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	12	24	12	14	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	16	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	5	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	60%	50%	57%	69%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	56%	58%	58%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	53%	43%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	62%	63%	77%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	69%	63%	62%	59%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	52%	51%	36%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	48%	53%	68%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	86 (0)	103 (0)	97 (0)	107 (0)	87 (0)	105 (0)	585 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 ()	8 ()	7 ()	8 ()	7 ()	5 ()	40 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	23 (0)	49 (0)	0 (0)	72 (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	54%	51%	3%	58%	-4%	
	2018	53%	50%	3%	57%	-4%	
Same Grade Comparison		1%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	54%	52%	2%	58%	-4%	
	2018	60%	49%	11%	56%	4%	
Same Grade Comparison		-6%					
Cohort Comparison		1%					
05	2019	72%	50%	22%	56%	16%	
	2018	63%	51%	12%	55%	8%	
Same Grade Comparison		9%					
Cohort Comparison		12%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	69%	61%	8%	62%	7%	
	2018	67%	59%	8%	62%	5%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	62%	64%	-2%	64%	-2%	
	2018	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%	
Same Grade Comparison		-14%					
Cohort Comparison		-5%					
05	2019	75%	57%	18%	60%	15%	
	2018	68%	61%	7%	61%	7%	
Same Grade Comparison		7%					
Cohort Comparison		-1%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	74%	49%	25%	53%	21%	
	2018	77%	56%	21%	55%	22%	
Same Grade Comparison		-3%					
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	18	28	17	28	23	6	45				

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
BLK	68	59	50	71	72	38	78				
HSP	48	53		76	76						
MUL	71	69		62	54						
WHT	53	55	44	67	64	33	71				
FRL	52	51	39	56	57	29	68				

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	33	40	40	48	47						
BLK	66	56	35	71	70	39	66				
HSP	68			79							
MUL	45	25		74	64						
WHT	57	44	40	74	65	42	81				
FRL	56	47	38	70	65	50	71				

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	41	25		48	31		40				
BLK	68	58	33	81	61	33	57				
HSP	58	57		63	43		58				
MUL	67			73							
WHT	69	60	48	74	59	40	77				
FRL	62	50	36	70	56	35	55				

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	415
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	62
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was gains in math made by the lowest performing quartile with 37% making gains compared to 45% making gains last year. Fourth grade math showed the greatest decreases with 5/23 (22%) of the lowest performing students making gains. A contributing factor is lack of consistency with the alignment of student work to the rigor of the standards. Also, timely feedback to students on formal and informal assessments to remediate error patterns was implemented inconsistently. Another contributing factor for a decrease in gains for fourth grade was the high number of SWD (23) children in this cadre.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was gains in math made by the lowest performing quartile with 37% making gains compared to 45% making gains last year. Fourth grade math showed the greatest decreases with 5/23 (22%) of the lowest performing students making gains. A contributing factor is lack of consistency with the alignment of student work to the rigor of the standards. Also, timely feedback to students on formal and informal assessments to remediate error patterns was implemented inconsistently. Another contributing factor for a decrease in gains for fourth grade was the high number of SWD (23) children in this cadre.

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 data component that has the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the bottom quartile in Math. At San Mateo, 37% of students in the bottom quartile made learning gains as compared to 45% from the previous year. When compared to the state, San Mateo is 14 percentage points below. Factors that contributed to this gap include consistent implementation and follow-up with Tier 2 differentiation, purposeful and intentional planning to address standards of deficiency and providing students immediate feedback to clarify possible misconceptions. In addition, the population of students with disabilities was a focus as their present levels of performance was far below grade level standards. V.E. teachers collaborated with general education teachers to identify focus areas. This has been an on-going trend of conversation. In an effort to increase bottom quartile gains in this

area, the administrative team will continue to planning with teachers and ensure that they are implemented with fidelity.

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

The data component that shows the most improvement is within literacy with an increase of 9 percentage points of student gains from 48% to 57%. The bottom quartile of students increased from 38% to 48% which is a 10 percentage point increase. As compared to the District, San Mateo surpassed learning gains by 1 percentage point and was only 1 percentage point below the state. The bottom quartile students were 2 percentage points below the district and 5 percentage points below the state. New actions that our school embarked upon in this areas included reviewing student work as aligned to standards, intentional planning and consistency with guided reading, differentiated Tier 2 plans, bite size and immediate feedback to students.

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

One potential area of concern as reflected from EWS data, is students identified as retainees. At San Mateo, we have 53 students in grades kindergarten through 5th grade that have been retained at least once. Nine of those identified students have been retained twice. An another area of concern is attendance. The data reflects that 40 students currently have an attendance rate below 90%.

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

1. Ambitious instruction aligned to the rigors of the standards
2. Ensuring a safe and secure learning environment that maximizes student learning.
3. Intentional and strategic common planning focused on student work
4. Cultivate a culture and climate that provides a positive and interactive environment for all stakeholders.
5. Increase teacher retention by fostering teacher leaders and building capacity.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	San Mateo Elementary's highest-priority area of focus is the Students with Disabilities subgroup. Analysis of data components indicates that this cohort of students decline in all areas for both reading and math.
Rationale	This area of focus was selected based on the drastic decline for SWD subgroup for proficiency, learning gains, and learning gains of the lower quartile of students. Data reflects a decline for both reading and math. Reading proficiency declined from 33% to 18%, learning gains from 40% to 28%, and lowest 25% from 40% to 17%. Math proficiency declined from 48% to 28% and 47% to 23% for learning gains. Data components indicate that the lowest 25% for 2019 is 6%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	San Mateo plans to accomplish the following achievement goals for SWD subgroup: Reading Proficiency will increase from 18% to 23%. Reading Learning Gains will increase from 28% to 33%. Reading Learning Gains for lowest quartile will increase from 17% to 22%. Math Proficiency will increase from 28% to 33%. Math Learning Gains will increase 23% to 28%. Math Learning Gains for lowest quartile will increase from 6% to 19%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Collaboration between V.E. teachers and general education teachers to plan purposeful and intentional lessons to address standards of deficiency. Consistent implementation and follow through with differentiated Tier 2 plans by all stakeholders, providing students immediate feedback to clarify possible misconceptions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence-based strategy was identified to allow teachers time to plan differentiated instruction with established systems for progress monitoring of student work and data. This will allow teachers, general education and V.E., the opportunity to utilize the data and make necessary instructional shifts towards standards mastery. The administrative team will observe evidence of this strategy through lesson plans, tier 2 plans, student work samples, formal and informal data and conversations with students.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will utilize common planning to review student data, content area strengths and weaknesses, review standards and student work samples and devise a plan to actively monitor academic growth of students with disabilities subgroup. 2. General Education teachers and V.E. teachers will use baseline data from state assessments, district assessments, i-Ready and Achieve 3000 to create differentiated standards based centers. Data from on-going progress monitoring assessments will be analyzed and instruction adjusted as needed. 3. Administration and teachers will meet in weekly common planning to review current data, student groupings, monitor student progress, and identify next steps for academic growth. 4. Students will be actively engaged in their own learning with accountability pieces to document student learning and growth.
Person Responsible	Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Based on data, our culture and climate goal will focus on building stronger relationships of care and support between faculty ans students. Data reflects the desire/need for meaningful connections in order to strengthen culture.
Rationale	Analysis of data indicates that a focus is needed to strengthen relationships between all stakeholders. If students and staff feel safe and valued, then San Mateo Elementary will foster a productive learning environment where students feel comfortable to take academic risks; thereby creating a positive school climate and culture for all stakeholders.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	San Mateo Elementary's projected outcome will be a decrease in discipline referrals, an increase in positive referrals and incentives, increased conduct grades, and a shift in positive thinking in the instructional setting and throughout the building. Establishing mentoring opportunities with identified students that would benefit from additional support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shaakera Thomas (thomass6@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Monitor systems to celebrate success including blending learning, reading goals, teacher recognition for creating positive classroom climates, immediate feedback provided to students and teachers, and intentional planning time for focused, collegial conversations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy will provide teachers, students and parents with a school climate that celebrates academics, behavior, and social interactions. Our goal is to model and cultivate a growth mindset that will lead to the development of the whole child.
Action Step	
Description	1. Collaborative Problem-Solving Team (CPST) will identify students most at risk and in need of mentors. 2. Professional Development for teacher led mentoring program. 3. Leadership Team will monitor blended learning and reading logs to celebrate success monthly and quarterly. 4. Each classroom will maintain with fidelity a classroom management system with clear expectations and incentives. 5. Review data from Impact Survey with feedback from teachers and students. In addition, teacher created survey
Person Responsible	Shaakera Thomas (thomass6@duvalschools.org)

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).