

Duval County Public Schools

San Mateo Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

San Mateo Elementary School

600 BAISDEN RD, Jacksonville, FL 32218

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wells, Caroline	Principal	<p>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.</p> <p>Collaborates with all stakeholders to ensure there is instructional efficacy and that our school's vision and mission guides our daily work.</p> <p>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.</p>
Poag, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	<p>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.</p> <p>Ms. Poag is a teacher leader who mentors novice teachers, leads coherent professional development and models highly effective instruction.</p>
Mendoza, Guadalupe	School Counselor	<p>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.</p>

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Leadership Team meets biweekly to analyze data and plan for next steps. SAC meets monthly to get information about current data, school programs and progress towards academic achievement goals.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP will be monitored by leadership team and SAC with focus on our ESE students. Data will also be analyzed for instructional purposes during weekly common planning.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	77%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	1	30	39	18	38	27	0	0	0	153	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	14	0	0	0	27	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	13	0	0	0	24	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	25	42	35	0	0	0	0	0	107	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	14	18	11	13	11	0	0	0	68

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	27	27	27	29	25	30	0	0	165	
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	16	0	0	0	31	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	7	21	0	0	0	33	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	32	37	0	0	0	0	0	76	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	11	27	24	6	18	0	0	0	86

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	27	27	27	29	25	30	0	0	165	
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in ELA	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	16	0	0	0	31	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	7	21	0	0	0	33	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	32	37	0	0	0	0	0	76	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	11	27	24	6	18	0	0	0	86

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61	48	53	66	50	56	63		
ELA Learning Gains				69			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			60		
Math Achievement*	70	58	59	73	48	50	68		
Math Learning Gains				69			60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			50		
Science Achievement*	59	52	54	56	59	59	50		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	253
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	59			
HSP	79			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	52			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	2	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	62			
HSP	71			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	44			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	61			70			59					
SWD	27			42			44				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	59			66			42				4	
HSP	71			86							2	
MUL	57			74			64				3	
PAC												
WHT	60			66			65				4	
FRL	54			56			40				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	66	69	37	73	69	50	56					
SWD	21	29	18	34	44	42						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	90			90								

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	66	72	40	77	80	52	50					
HSP	73	71		81	57							
MUL	60	72		84	72		40					
PAC												
WHT	65	63	32	64	63	47	67					
FRL	46	51	29	53	51	35	41					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	63	60	68	60	50	50					
SWD	26	55		38	40		10					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	59	62		55	45		45					
HSP	63			84								
MUL	75			71								
PAC												
WHT	62	59	58	72	62		49					
FRL	43	63	50	48	47	38	31					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
05	2023 - Spring	61%	47%	14%	54%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	50%	20%	58%	12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	61%	46%	15%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	71%	59%	12%	59%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	58%	20%	61%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	52%	14%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	58%	48%	10%	51%	7%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

ELA data, historically, is the component that shows the lowest performance. Proficiency, as measured by the state assessment, for the last three years has been 63%, 66%, and 63%.

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

The most recent data was consistent as it measured proficiency. The greatest decline was in fifth grade math and ela. Math dropped from 71% proficiency to 66% and Ela dropped from 69% to 61% proficient. This cohort of students, though, are trending consistently in both Ela and math. For Ela, in 3rd grade the proficiency was 63%, in 4th grade Ela was 64%. For math, in 3rd grade proficiency was 61%, in 4th grade 64%. This lack of growth for gains and LPQ is also an area of decline for San Mateo. Some factors that may have contributed to this is lack of experienced teachers particularly our ESE/VE teachers. Also, this cohort of students were taught virtually during the pandemic.

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.

San Mateo historically scores higher than the state average in all content areas. Our area of focus this year will be Ela because our scores are not increasing and in 5th grade Ela proficiency declined from

69% proficiency to 61% proficiency. Learning gains in Ela are also low and dropped from 60% to 37% in the 21-22 school year.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is 4th grade Ela. 4th grade Ela increased from 64% proficiency to 70% proficiency. This cohort of students scored 61% proficiency the previous year. Actions that led to this increase were consistent common planning with administration and with teachers. Also, consistent data analysis and aligned tier 2 instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The most extreme are of concern is the number of students identified with a substantial reading deficiency in our primary grades: 1st grade is 25, 2nd grade is 42 and 3rd grade is 35 students

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

1. Ela LPQ
2. Ela Proficiency
3. Math LPQ

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

It is important to maintain a collegial staff that can focus on the needs of our students. Leadership will provide teachers daily opportunities to be successful including consistent, scheduled times for collaboration and celebrations. San Mateo's proficiency in both Ela and Math is strong as measured by the state assessment and teachers are to be commended. The school's demographics are evolving and this will be our first year as a Title 1 school; thus, how we address students' academic and social-emotional is evolving to accommodate various needs of our students

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.

We will provide opportunities for staff feedback and collaboration. Agendas and meeting notes will be maintained.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To ensure that all stakeholders are thoroughly informed of school functions, operations, expectations, etc. With one, all-inclusive platform, morale and successful experiences will increase.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELA proficiency (3rd- 61%, 4th- 70%, 5th-61%). 5th grade ela proficiency dropped from 69% to 61% . There is a great need to move our lowest-performing students in the subject area specifically our ese students.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

San Mateo will increase our ela proficiency from 63% to 68%.

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, consistent walk-throughs with feedback, common planning agendas and data chats with students and teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Ensure the highest quality of instruction, that is standards-based and grade-level appropriate, for all students. Teachers will utilize district-based curriculum including components of the curriculum that provide learning opportunities for enrichment and remediation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Consistently monitor both formal and informal student data to make informed decisions about reteaching and making necessary adjustments as needed. This includes using anecdotes to plan for next steps. Students will participate in data chats with teachers and with parents during Parent Informational Events.

Daily, intentional small group instruction that is differentiated to include remediation and documentation. Teacher knowledge of Benchmark Advance has excellent resources to assist with planning. Time will be

provided to teachers to become familiar and comfortable with the many differentiated resources to advance student learning based on their individual needs. This includes leveled books and non-fiction sets that are directly aligned to science content.

Provide model classrooms on each grade level to teachers the opportunity to participate in observations of best practices as a method of support as needed.

Person Responsible: Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 30, 2024

Coaches and admin. will be available for modeling lessons (side by side teaching) for novice teachers or teachers new to a grade level.

Person Responsible: Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 30, 2023

Weekly common planning with Coaches & Admin. With an emphasis in starting with the focus benchmark, analyzing the Curriculum Guide and planning instruction that will best guide students to benchmark mastery. Planning for Tier 1 support during Core instruction is also a priority.

Person Responsible: Caroline Wells (wellsc@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 30, 2023

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Historically San Mateo's LPQ data is low and dropped from 60% to 37% last year. This subgroup includes our ESE students who are not making gains. This is a critical area of focus for us.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

LPQ gains will increase from 37% to 42% during the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Weekly meetings to monitor formal and informal data. Consistent classroom observations to review lesson plans and provide teachers with feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

- *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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

na

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

na

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

na

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

na

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

na

Monitoring**Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

na

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

nna

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

na

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

na

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Opportunities will be provided at various times before school, after school and during

school. When appropriate, Teams will be used to increase parent access to information

regarding the school, events and learning opportunities.

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Consistent communication about planned events, opportunities for feedback, providing parents

with essential information to partner with the school to increase student achievement, continuous

information about data and what the school is doing to provide effective pedagogy with fidelity.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Teachers will have professional development opportunities to unpack standards and plan lessons that are strongly aligned to the intent of the benchmarks. Effective using curriculum guides and materials to provide focused, meaningful lessons including small group instruction.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

na

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

na

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

na

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

San Mateo implements with fidelity the PBIS model emphasizing positive behaviors.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Teachers will participate in district professional development that is aligned to our instructional goals. All instructional staff will participate in school-based common planning and PLC's.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

na

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No