San Mateo Elementary School

2020-21 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: 7/14/2020

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)	77%
2019-20 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%)
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 Mateo Elementary School

600 BAISDEN RD, Jacksonville, FL 32218

http://www.duvalschools.org/sanmateo

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	65%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

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

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.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/14/2020, Caroline Wells L

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.*
2

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
36

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)	77%
2019-20 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%)
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	85	99	100	106	88	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	9	12	10	13	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	24	49	51	40	13	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	23	58	57	46	18	230	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	432

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	18	40	44	32	13	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/5/2020

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	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

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	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

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	
	(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	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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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				
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%	1
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%	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	62
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	63
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	64
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	55
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	50
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 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 for 2018- 2019.
During the 2018 -2019 school 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. Due to COVID-19, there was no state
testing for 2019-2020. Learning gains for the lowest performing quartile students will be reflected in
the performance of 5th grade students for 2020- 2021. Students in this cohort made 100% gains for
the lower performing quartile as third grade students.

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 for 2018-2019.
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 Elementary, 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
plan standards based instruction with teachers, ensure that student work and assessments are
aligned to standards, and monitor to ensure it is 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 Elementary 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?

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 and aligned assessments.
4. Cultivate a culture and climate that provides a positive, trusting, 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. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	More than a decade of research suggests that improving the quality of instruction and student learning requires leaders to set a vision for instruction, promote teacher learning around that vision, and foster organizational conditions for teacher collaboration and growth (Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010). Yet designing professional learning that enhances instructional leadership has proven challenging. Previous attempts may have been unsuccessful because they targeted only school principals rather than teams of leaders or because they were conducted away from school sites rather than being job-embedded. Increasing school leaders' knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment is insufficient. Improving instructional leadership requires increasing school leaders' direct involvement with teachers in these core areas. A team-based approach to professional learning is more effective in enhancing the instructional leadership. (Elizabeth Leisy Stosich, Michelle L. Forman, and Candice Bocala JUNE 2019) In schools with Effective Leaders, principals and teachers work together to implement a shared vision. In such schools, people, programs, and resources are focused on a vision for sustained improvement. School leaders: practice shared leadership, set high goals for quality instruction, maintain mutually trusting and respectful relationships, support professional advancement for faculty and staff. On San Mateo's 2019 5Essentials Survey, Effective Leadership scored a 34 which falls into the weak category. For a school to continuously improve, the leadership team should be an active and skilled group that sets high standards for teaching and student learning. It is critical to positively impact student learning that teachers have influence in a broad range of decisions regarding school policies and practices in an environment that promotes trust, respect and encouragement so that all voices can be heard and valued.
Measurable Outcome:	On the 2020 5Essentials Teacher Survey, the category of Effective Leadership will change from the measure of 34 to 61.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation article, 4 Ways that Leadership Teams Create Conditions for Success in Schools, when teachers are involved in examining data and making important decisions based on data that inform how they continuously improve their schools, leadership teams can ensure that everyone in the building is focused on the core business of the school—improving student learning outcomes. San Mateo will initiate a school-based Leadership Team that will focus on data, instructional practices, and drive the vision and mission of our school to improve communication and allow staff members the opportunity to participate in school based decisions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the 2019 5Essentials Teacher Survey, teachers do not feel they are a part of the decision making process at San Mateo and the survey also indicates a need to provide opportunities for teachers to work together as school leaders to strengthen mutual trust and respect.
Action Steps to Implement	

Analyze data with Leadership Team to determine SME's goals for school improvement.

Person Responsible   Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

Create and assign measurable action steps with a timeline.

Person Responsible   Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

Verify progress by regularly reviewing the outcomes.

Person Responsible   Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

Continued analysis of data and progress towards school goals and adjust plan as needed for continuous improvement.

Person Responsible   Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

Schedule quarterly "reset" conversations with individual teachers to get personal feedback about school improvement and send out brief monthly surveys to monitor progress towards goals.

Person Responsible   Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	San Mateo Elementary's highest-priority area of focus is ensuring that all teachers strategically plan differentiated learning opportunities for all students to increase learning gains and lower performing quartile gains. Tier II small group instruction provides students with explicit instruction focusing on identified areas of need. Through tier II instruction students will receive more individualized instruction in mastering prerequisite skills and expanding standards that have been mastered. Differentiated instruction provides students with the opportunity to meet and exceed grade level proficiency. On San Mateo's 2019 5 Essentials Survey, Reflective Dialogue scored an 8 which falls in the very weak category. This indicates that discussions around student work, how students learn best, and differentiation are not consistently occurring during teacher-lead common planning. In order to increase gains for the lower performing quartile students and increase gains for proficient students, continuity must be evident from admin- led common planning, professional learning communities and early release professional development.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase reading learning gains by 5 points from 57% to 62%. Increase reading lower performing quartile gains by 5 points from 48% to 53%. Increase math learning gains by 5 points from 69% to 74%. Increase math lower performing quartile gains by 13 points from 37% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Carol Tomlinson and Tonya Moon's Assessment in a differentiated classroom published in Better Evidence- Based Education from John Hopkins School of Education, Volume 3, Issue 3, teachers have a diverse population of learners that includes readiness, culture, motivation, access to technology, language and other contributing factors. With this in mind, teachers are able to utilize informal and formal data to gauge where students are academically and create fluid groupings based on identified standards. In a differentiated classroom, teachers would use this data to make decisions about individualized instruction for student groups and measure the effectiveness of the instruction. Collaboration between teachers and administration to plan purposeful lessons to address standards of deficiency. Consistent implementation 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. teacher, 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 Steps to Implement

Teachers will utilize common planning to review identified standards, student data, content area strengths and weaknesses, and student work samples. The team will devise a plan to actively monitor academic growth of students with based on specific standards.

Person Responsible	Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will conduct on-going classroom observations and focus walks to monitor implementation of standards based instruction, aligned standards based activities, and informal and formal assessments based on identified standards.

Person Responsible   Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence of the use of the District Instructional Framework, collaborative learning strategies, meta-cognitive strategies, scaffolded instruction, higher level questioning techniques, and checks for understanding will be utilized to document implementation within reading and math. Professional Development, coaching, and modeling will be provided to support individual teacher needs.

Person Responsible   Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

Administration will conduct on-going data chats with teachers to review current data, student groupings, monitor student progress, and identify next steps for academic growth.

Person Responsible   Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

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)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the article, Unpacking instructional alignment: The influence of teachers' use of assessment data on instruction by Abrams, Varier & Jackson: Alignment of instruction and assessment is fundamental for the accurate measurement of student learning. As such, the alignment or coherence among curriculum standards, instruction, and assessment is essential for standards based assessment and evidenced-based instructional programmes. Assessment data are intended to inform instruction and broader school improvement efforts and guide administrative and instructional decisions in an effort to raise student achievement. According to Turner and Coburn (2012: 3), the use of data is "one of the most central reform ideas in contemporary school policy and practice". On San Mateo's Standards Based Walkthrough data dashboard, the sum of Averages for Assessing Student Learning was a 2.1. Determining Mastery rated 0.7, Learning Arc Alignment rated 0.8 and FSA Alignment rated 1.4. This data indicates that students are not engaged in student work and assessments that is aligned to the rigors of grade level standards. There is disconnect in teacher perception of instructional activities as evidenced on the 5Essentials Teacher Survey. On this survey, the area that scored the highest was Ambitious Instruction which includes: English Instruction, Math Instruction, Academic Press and Quality of Student Discussion. Our four year historical state assessment data shows that our student gains and Lowest Performing Quartile students are not growing academically in Math and Reading. It is necessary that students are provided with opportunities to engage in grade level activities and assessments that are aligned to instruction so that students can master grade level standards.
Measurable Outcome:	As measured on the Standards Based Walkthrough Tool Dashboard, San Mateo will rate 3.5 on Assessing Student Learning during the 2020-21 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	San Mateo will use the Learning Arc Creation document to train teachers to fully understand the outcomes of standards and plan for instruction so that students have the opportunity to participate in activities that will lead them to standards mastery. The principal and assistant principal will monitor Assessing Student Learning, Student Work, Learning Arc Alignment, and FSA alignment using the Standards Based Walkthrough Tool to monitor progress and plan for next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To move students academically, teachers need to be able to interact confidently with grade level standards to plan appropriate grade level student activities and assessments. Using the Learning Arc Creation document will facilitate this process. Monitoring implementation in the classroom will allow our leadership team to develop next steps for teacher development.

Action Steps to Implement

Engage in purposeful planning: Train teachers to use Learning Arc as a tool towards standards mastery, Leverage OneNote Resources and provide on-grade level instruction.

Person Responsible	Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

Monitor classroom instruction using Standards Based Walkthrough Tool, analyze progress of aligning assessment to the rigors of the standard, analyze data, and develop next steps for teacher development.

Person Responsible	Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

With teachers, analyze student work to determine standard mastery and planning for instructional next steps.

Person Responsible	Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

Use data collected from Standards Based Instruction reviews to make revisions as necessary and to focus on next steps.

Person Responsible	Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Tardies at San Mateo average 30 each day. Instructional time is lost and many of the students who are tardy or checked out early are our lowest performing students. SME will initiate programs to encourage students to be on time for school including: incentives, recognition and parent communication.

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.

Celebrating successes, two-way communication and building strong collaborative partnerships with all stakeholders are priorities at San Mateo Accelerated Academy. The School Advisory Council participates in the development, implementation and evaluation of school level plans that include the School Improvement Plan. Over 50% of the SAC members are non-employees. All parents are given the opportunity to review all plans and offer suggestions prior to approval. Their input is documented through the sign-in sheets and the minutes from the planning meetings. School Advisory Council meetings are held monthly and general PTA meetings are held bimonthly.

Our goal is to increase participation by all parent support groups. Parent survey results are reviewed by the SAC, staff and PTA members for continuous improvement at SME.

San Mateo actively seeks new business partners annually to assist with instructional and mentoring

support. Working collaboratively with our PTA and SAC, San Mateo has established many business partnerships with local business and churches in and around our immediate neighborhood. Our business partners provide support to our staff and students during pre-planning, Orientation, Open House, Reading Celebrations, Parent Nights and FSA Celebrations. We also have a business partner that provides monetary support for students who are unable afford field trips and supplies. Recognition in our weekly newsletter, website and social media is shared in support of our business partners.

San Mateo strongly believes in providing students with a well-rounded educational experience. We have several teacher sponsored student groups that are involved in leadership roles and opportunity to participate in school-based decisions. We are very proud of our student leaders who participate in groups such as National Elementary Honor Society, Student Council, Teachers of Tomorrow, Morning Announcers and Safety Patrol.

Students are encouraged to participate in voting for Teacher of the Month, Daily Inspirational Quotes, book recommendations, content based trivia and yearbook design to name a few activities to provide opportunities for be a proud Loyal Lion!

All students at San Mateo are valued and encouraged to share their ideas, questions and concerns to be actively engaged.

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: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00