Ruth N. Upson Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ruth N. Upson Elementary School

1090 DANCY ST, Jacksonville, FL 32205

http://www.duvalschools.org/upson

Demographics

Principal: Yvonne Spinner

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of Ruth N. Upson Elementary School is to engage, empower and educate students to achieve their potential in the global community.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision of Ruth N. Upson Elementary School is to inspire and provide opportunities for every student to think, to learn, to achieve, and to become a better person in our global community.

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
Spinner, Yvonne	Principal	Instructional Leader, classroom observations and coaching.
Royal, Jeffrey	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, classroom observations and coaching.
McLarty, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach-Kim McLarty- Professional development and monitoring of effective reading and writing instruction in grades K-5.
Smith, Arianne	Guidance Counselor	Arianne Smith- School Counselor - Responsible for school counseling services and leadership for resource teacher team.
Stratton, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Model ELA classroom teacher serving as demonstration classroom for peers and lead teacher.
Stallings, Katherine	Instructional Coach	Primary ELA Interventionist-Katherine Stallings- Professional development and monitoring of effective reading and writing instruction in grades K-5.
Dixon, Retha	Teacher, K-12	Model Mathclassroom teacher serving as a demonstration classroom for peers and lead teacher.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/22/2019, Yvonne Spinner

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.*
1

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
19

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	23	53	74	65	64	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	325
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	18	32	28	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 6/22/2020

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	54	76	72	71	52	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	396
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	2	4	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	1	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	2	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	54	76	72	71	52	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	396
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	2	4	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	1	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	2	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	65%	50%	57%	58%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	56%	58%	47%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	50%	53%	38%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	76%	62%	63%	74%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	64%	63%	62%	45%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	52%	51%	39%	48%	47%
Science Achievement	52%	48%	53%	67%	55%	55%

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	63%	51%	12%	58%	5%
	2018	60%	50%	10%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	52%	14%	58%	8%
	2018	51%	49%	2%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	61%	50%	11%	56%	5%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	74%	61%	13%	62%	12%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	80%	59%	21%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	64%	21%	64%	21%
	2018	66%	60%	6%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	71%	57%	14%	60%	11%
	2018	62%	61%	1%	61%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	50%	49%	1%	53%	-3%
	2018	68%	56%	12%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	44	42		64	70		40				
BLK	54	54	43	61	56	44	28				
MUL	57	64		85	80						
WHT	70	58	36	84	69		69				
FRL	62	59	48	72	68	52	42				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**
SWD	40	44	38	55	33	38	46				
BLK	37	36	33	61	40	29	54				
MUL	76	70		71	30						
WHT	66	48	36	84	48	54	76				
FRL	56	48	43	74	45	38	63				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	409
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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
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	49
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	72

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
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	58
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

ELA Bottom 25% showed the lowest performance. Trends indicated a lack of gains for those students.

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

5th grade science scores showed the greates decline from the previous years. This was a function of going from a dedicated science teacher to a math/science split.

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

ELA Bottom 25% sowed the greatest gap compared with the state. Professional development and individualized student instruction contributed to this gap.

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

Math gains schoolwide showed the greates gains. We implemented a power hour for our 4th and 5th grade students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance and student retention continues to be a concern.

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

1. ELA Lowest quartile Gains
2. ELA gains
3. Science
4. Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By increasing instructional practice, elements of effective teaching methods will improve student achievement. This area was identified as a critical need because undesirable data was found in Reading in 4th and 5th grade in gains and lowest performing quartile, as well as, 5th grade science scores showed the greatest decline from the previous years. Our math scores have also remained stagnant.
Measureable Outcome:	75% of our core teachers will engage in successful standards-based instructional planning procedures. During the planning process teachers will maintain conversation around standard-based planning ensuring fully aligned tasks and materials are selected.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yvonne Spinner (couturey@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on our Standards Walk-Through Data, we showed a .8 on student task alignment with standards. In response, a Reading coach position will be used to design, monitor, and assess reading achievement progress; provide professional development and coaching for teachers, engaging them in successful standards-based instruction, tasks, and assessments. In addition to this strategy, three full time para-professionals, and 1/2 of a media specialist position will be used to provide students support and supplemental instruction in reading. Based on Standards Walkthrough Tool, our school can measure classrooms that have aligned standards and experiences.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, our school needs to ensure students are receiving standards-aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so they are prepared to face state assessments. Aligning content and teacher instructional practice through professional development provided by a high quality coach will increase teachers' content knowledge, delivery modes, and engagement to improve student outcomes. As an evidence-based strategy, coaches help teachers develop expertise in academic standard and instructional pedagogy. Along with teacher improvement, increased student support and individualization through the use of para-professionals and media support to increase small-group direct intervention instruction for students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use District aligned Standards Walkthrough Tool to monitor instructional delivery of standards and assist with the key focus of PLC planning.

Person Responsible	Yvonne Spinner (couturey@duvalschools.org)

2. Use Coach to provide professional development and support to teachers for improved instruction. Coach will support PLC procedures with measurable improvement based on SIP and school improvement rounds feedback to move toward aligned tasks and materials.

Person Responsible	Kimberly McLarty (mclartyk@duvalschools.org)

3. Use Media specialist to provide direct support to students through resource support.

| **Person Responsible** | Jeffrey Royal (royalj@duvalschools.org) |

4. Use three para-professionals to support small group student academics and instruction.

| **Person Responsible** | Jeffrey Royal (royalj@duvalschools.org) |

5. Purchase general supplies to support academic interventions.

| **Person Responsible** | Yvonne Spinner (couturey@duvalschools.org) |

6. Tutoring will be made available to our students to improve their achievement and provide support in their specific academic areas of need in either reading, math or science.

| **Person Responsible** | Jeffrey Royal (royalj@duvalschools.org) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Throughout the evaluation of Standards Based Walkthrough's, School Improvement Rounding, teacher schedules, PLC schedules and agendas, classroom observations, student work, and professional learning, teacher instruction will be monitored and adjusted to target addition schoolwide improvement priorities.

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.

The school holds multiple educational academic and developmental functions and community building activities throughout the year. Students, Teachers, Parents and community members regularly attend and are able to interact. The school will continue to build partnerships with local businesses by advertising various businesses in the Back-to School Flyer and weekly parent communications. Ruth Upson encourages the student families to support the business partners and in return, the businesses are contributing resources to the school. The school has also created working relationships with multiple faith-based organizations and non-profit

agencies. This enables the school to meet the physical, emotional, and social needs of the student body.

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	
1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**