San Mateo Elementary School

2022-23 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: 7/1/2015

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (60%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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.](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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	77%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wells, Caroline	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making with all content areas, ensures the school-based team is implementing Rti with fidelity, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support Rti implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based intervention plans and activities. Collaborates with all stakeholders to ensure there is instructional efficacy and that our school's vision and mission guides our daily work. Maintains a positive school culture that recognized the success and achievements for academic and social growth so that all students can achieve to their highest potential.
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 Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Ms. Poag is a teacher leader who mentors novice teachers, leads coherent professional development and models highly effective instruction.
Mendoza, Guadalupe	School Counselor	Provides quality services on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. Links 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 and participates in behavioral data collection.
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, andintegratesTier1materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.
Johnson, Laquitrice	Assistant Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making with literacy and math, ensures 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. Fosters an environment wherein teachers, staff, students and parents

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		are able to collaborate and contribute to the success of San Mateo through data- driven decisions, collective feedback, and innovative instructional practices.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Caroline Wells L

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

545

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	72	99	82	94	82	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	528
Attendance below 90 percent	0	27	27	27	29	25	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	7	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	32	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	11	27	24	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/13/2022

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	90	79	84	97	93	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	573
Attendance below 90 percent	1	21	14	22	18	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	1	2	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	1	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	6	26	25	22	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	1	9	23	30	28	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	7	16	26	23	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

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	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	90	79	84	97	93	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	573
Attendance below 90 percent	1	21	14	22	18	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	1	2	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	1	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	6	26	25	22	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	1	9	23	30	28	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	7	16	26	23	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

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	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	66%	50%	56%				60%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	69%						57%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						48%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	73%	48%	50%				69%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	69%						69%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						37%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	59%	59%				75%	48%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	54%	51%	3%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	52%	2%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	72%	50%	22%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	69%	61%	8%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	64%	-2%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	75%	57%	18%	60%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	74%	49%	25%	53%	21%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	21	29	18	34	44	42					
ASN	90			90							
BLK	66	72	40	77	80	52	50				
HSP	73	71		81	57						
MUL	60	72		84	72		40				
WHT	65	63	32	64	63	47	67				
FRL	46	51	29	53	51	35	41				

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26	55		38	40		10				
BLK	59	62		55	45		45				
HSP	63			84							
MUL	75			71							
WHT	62	59	58	72	62		49				
FRL	43	63	50	48	47	38	31				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
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	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
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	90
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	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	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	66
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	57
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA proficiency, overall gains and LPQ gains in 3rd, 4th and 5th remain lower than Math proficiency. In ELA, Key Ideas and Details had the highest percentage of students scoring below 75% for 3rd & 4th grade. In ELA, for 4th and 5th grade, the Language & Editing content area's percentage of students scoring below 75% was matched or exceeded by the percentage of students scoring below a 7 on the Text-Based Writing.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data components that showed the most improvement as measured by the Florida State Assessment are math gains from 60% to 69%. Math proficiency increased from 68% to 73%. The component reflecting the greatest need for improvement as measured by the FSA is gains made by the LPQ for ELA. ELA LPG gains dropped from 60% to 37%. ESE teacher vacancies throughout the year may have contributed to this decrease. Consistent collaboration, differentiation and explicit standard-based instruction is needed to increase the proficiency of this subgroup to at least 50%. According to state assessment, LPQ gains demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. A focus on small group instruction that are planned using the most current data is necessary to make these needed improvements in student achievement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Actions needed:
* A drill down of specific students that fall into the identified subgroups- scoring below 75% in a particular content area.
* Explicit revisiting of each content area and what each entails/demands.
* Revisiting of unpacking of the standards that fall under each content area, to ensure a thorough understanding on teachers' part prior to planning of lessons.
* Explicit instruction and differentiated lessons to address specific areas of deficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

3rd grade Math, based on state assessment, show the highest percent in proficiency.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors to this improvement 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. We will continue with these actions to increase proficiency and gains across intermediate grades. Also, strategic placement of teachers by grade level/subject area and pairing of team teachers.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Actions needed:
* A drill down of specific students that fall into the identified subgroups- scoring below 75% in a particular content area.
* Explicit revisiting of each content area and what each entails/demands.
* Revisiting of unpacking of the standards that fall under each content area, to ensure a thorough understanding on teachers' part prior to planning of lessons.
* Explicit instruction and differentiated lessons to address specific areas of deficiency.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional Development Opportunities:
* Unpacking of Content Areas by subject area; conversation surrounding teaching implications
* Conversations surrounding possible reasons for students' underperformance
* In depth unpacking of standards; linking standards' expectations to appropriate curriculum resources & supplemental material

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional services:
* Solicitation of content-area specialists to assist with understanding, planning and best use of new curriculum resources.
* Time for teachers to continue to get familiar with new curriculum, with guidance and opportunities to collaborate and learn from peers.
* Implement research based curriculum/instruction with a full time Math Interventionist.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	ELA proficiency (3rd- 61%, 4th- 63%, 5th-68%), overall gains (69%)and LPQ gains (37%) in 3rd, 4th and 5th remain in the lower than Math proficiency and gains. There is a great need to move our lowest-performing students in the subject area.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percentage of our lowest performing quartile students will increase by ten or more percentage points.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area will be monitored by assessing the students' actual work and assessments during common planning, and planning needed scaffolds and interventions specifically for this subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Ensure the highest quality of instruction, that is standards-based and grade-level appropriate, for all students. Teachers will utilize components of the learning arc and standards focus board to help ensure quality instruction flow and alignment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	If all the teachers and support staff are focused on a common set of learning priorities, able to build upon what went before in preparation for what comes after, students have a higher probability of success. (Based on Opportunity Myth)

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

*Analyze data with Leadership Team to determine SME's goals for school improvement.
*Create and assign measurable action steps with a timeline.
*Verify progress by regularly reviewing the outcomes.
*Continued analysis of data and progress towards school goals and adjust plan as needed for continuous improvement.
*Schedule weekly content area PLC's and Common Planning with agendas that are aligned with current data.

Person Responsible   Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to faculty and staff morale	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Leadership believes that a large percentage of teachers either do not fully understand the criteria outlined on CAST rubric, and/or have become complacent. There may be a correlation to the school grade remaining the same over a period of time. The school's demographics have begun to change; thus, how we address students' academic and social-emotional may need to adjust to accommodate various needs.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Leadership will collaborate on enhanced communication for school as a whole, beginning with leadership, trickling down to office staff, faculty, and other stakeholders, with the intended outcome of 95% or higher of all stakeholders feels empowered, supported and comfortable communicating needs, keeping with professional code of conduct.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	A user-friendly, school-wide accessible platform will be utilized, allowing leadership to regularly check usage, feedback, via reports. Leadership and staff can easily provide incentives for adequate usage. One or more surveys will be administered periodically for a pulse check.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Provide access and training on a common platform for school-wide communication, as well as explicit training on the CAST rubric.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	To ensure that all stakeholders are thoroughly informed of school functions, operations, expectations, etc. With one, all-inclusive platform, confusion is greatly reduced.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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.

Person Responsible   Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on state assessment, Numbers and Operations- Fractions had the highest percentage of students scoring below 75% in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percentage of our lowest performing quartile students will increase by ten or more percentage points.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area will be monitored by assessing the students' actual work and assessments during common planning, and planning needed scaffolds and interventions specifically for this subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laquitrice Johnson (moselyl@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Ensure the highest quality of instruction, that is standards-based and grade-level appropriate, for all students. Teachers will utilize components of the learning arc and standards focus board to help ensure quality instruction flow and alignment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	If all the teachers and support staff are focused on a common set of learning priorities, able to build upon what went before in preparation for what comes after, students have a higher probability of success. (Based on Opportunity Myth)

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

* 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 based on specific standards.
* Administrators will conduct on-going classroom observations and walkthroughs to monitor implementation
of standards based instruction, aligned standards based activities, and informal and formal assessments based on identified standards.
* 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 with a focus on Instructional Rounding, coaching, and modeling for individual teacher needs.

Person Responsible   Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

San Mateo continuously provides a positive school culture by implementing a coherent shared vision among all. Our vision and practice allow staff, students and parents an open forum to express their concerns and opinions. The administrative team has an open-door policy, that allows faculty and staff freedom to share ideas and/or initiatives. Surveys such as the 5Essentials, provide feedback that helps the administration to target areas of need related to the climate and culture. The establishment of teams such as Leadership, Shared Decision Making and PBIS ensures the voice of school-based stakeholders is considered as it relates to instructional needs and/or practices, the daily routines, and school-wide behavior concerns.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Administrators make every attempt to speak positive words to students and teachers at the beginning of each day. Students engage in daily morning meetings that integrate Sanford Harmony/Calm Classroom lessons.