Ruth N. Upson Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ruth N. Upson Elementary School

1090 DANCY ST, Jacksonville, FL 32205

http://www.duvalschools.org/upson

Demographics

Principal: Faith Roberts Graham

Start Date for this Principal: 8/4/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Ruth N. Upson Elementary School

1090 DANCY ST, Jacksonville, FL 32205

http://www.duvalschools.org/upson

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

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.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Roberts, Faith	Principal	Instructional Leader, classroom observations, and coaching.
Royal, Jeffrey	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, classroom observations, and coaching.
Stallings, Katherine	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach-Katherine Stallings- Professional development and monitoring of effective reading and writing instruction in grades K-5.
Stratton, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Model ELA classroom teacher serving as a demonstration classroom for peers and lead teacher.
Dixon, Retha	Teacher, K-12	Model Math classroom teacher serving as a demonstration classroom for peers and lead teacher.
Smith, Arianne	School Counselor	Arianne Smith- School Counselor - Responsible for school counseling services and leadership for the resource teacher team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/4/2020, Faith Roberts Graham

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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

347

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

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

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	44	44	56	75	62	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	335
Attendance below 90 percent	16	14	29	19	26	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	9	20	29	16	28	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Course failure in Math	6	1	4	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	20	29	16	28	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

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	4	18	32	28	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/6/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	44	44	56	75	62	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	335
Attendance below 90 percent	16	14	29	19	26	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	9	20	29	16	28	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Course failure in Math	6	1	4	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	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%

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
03	2021					
	2019	63%	51%	12%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	52%	14%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	50%	11%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	61%	13%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	85%	64%	21%	64%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	57%	14%	60%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	50%	49%	1%	53%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Grades 1-2 data complied using iReady Data
Grades 3-5 data complied using PMA Data

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13/26%	25/48%	32/62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/27%	17/44%	22/57%
	Students With Disabilities	2/15%	5/42%	6/46%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12/24%	14/26%	30/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/27%	10/25%	20/53%
	Students With Disabilities	3/23%	3/25%	5/38%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16/22%	35/48%	43/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/15%	20/42%	25/54%
	Students With Disabilities	3/20%	6/43%	7/54%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9/12%	21/29%	47/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/13%	12/25%	29/63%
	Students With Disabilities	2/13%	2/14%	6/46%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/100%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33/56%	34/59%	33/56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/53%	20/53%	19/50%
	Students With Disabilities	6/35%	6/33%	4/22%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/50%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37/63%	40/69%	37/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27/68%	26/68%	21/55%
	Students With Disabilities	8/47%	8/44%	6/33%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/50%	1/50%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27/42%	31/51%	30/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/42%	24/53%	23/58%
	Students With Disabilities	2/13%	6/43%	8/57%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37/58%	29/49%	24/46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/52%	22/51%	19/48%
	Students With Disabilities	8/53%	5/38%	3/21%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

	Grade 5			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25/60%	31/79%	32/84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/44%	18/78%	17/74%
	Students With Disabilities	5/56%	4/50%	5/56%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31/74%	23/59%	31/82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/63%	12/52%	17/74%
	Students With Disabilities	5/56%	4/50%	6/67%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27/64%	28/76%	31/84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/59%	15/65%	18/78%
	Students With Disabilities	4/44%	4/57%	6/67%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Subgroup Data Review

	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	49	77		47	69		58				
BLK	42	63		49	53		40				
WHT	80	96		80	92		92				
FRL	61	79		64	78		65				
	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	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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
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	507
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	60
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	88
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	69
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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?

Math proficiency was the greatest decline from 76% to 68%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on our FSA data from 2019 to 2021, our students demonstrated a decrease by 8%. Many of the
students in the lowest quartile are ESE and did not demonstrate a year's growth. In addition, our DHVR students show no growth as well.

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

New actions- Provide our ESE more intentional small group instruction. Provide our DHVR students with remediation on skills and strategies that were not exposed to in a face-to-face setting because of the global pandemic.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our learning gains in ELA demonstrated the most improvement. Our gains increased
from 65% to 84%. After analysis of student data, our teachers used Tier 2 resources such
as the Ready LAFS Teacher Toolkit and Small group instruction to remediate skills
with students.

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

The contributing factor to this improvement was aligning standard-based instruction and providing students with small group instruction.

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

Continue small group instruction.

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.

Create a professional development calendar that will offer opportunities that will support teachers.

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

To ensure the sustainability of improvement for next year and beyond, teachers will provide meaningful small group instruction that focuses on standards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the total number of SWT observations conducted last year, our rating averaged 2.8 out of 5 in the area of Assessing Student Learning. Our data shows that teachers need to improve in the areas of determining mastery of standards, alignment to the Learning Arc, and alignment to the FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	75% of our core content teachers will engage in successful standards-based planning procedures with a focus on student tasks and assessments. During the planning process, teachers will maintain conversation around standard-based planning ensuring fully aligned tasks and materials are selected.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored through SWT data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Faith Roberts (robertsf@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional delivery ensures that students are exposed to standards-aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments. Evidence will include student work samples and teacher assessments. Student work will be analyzed using the student work protocol.

Provide immediate feedback, PD, and support to teachers using data from the Standards Walk-Through Tool. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, all students need to have greater access to grade-appropriate assignments. All students, especially those who are behind grade level, need access to instruction that asks them to think and engage deeply with challenging material. |

Action Steps to Implement	

During PLCs, the Admin Team will provide monthly training to teachers on how to use the Learning Arc to determine alignment to the standard.

Person Responsible	Jeffrey Royal (royalj@duvalschools.org)

Use Coach to provide professional development and support to teachers for improved instruction. The 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	Katherine Stallings (stallingsk@duvalschools.org)

Calibrated Administration: The leadership team will conduct instructional rounds to ensure a shared vision, and expectations of standards-based Instruction (virtually and face to face) are established throughout the school quarterly.

Person Responsible	Faith Roberts (robertsf@duvalschools.org)

Data Review: The leadership team will conduct ongoing data reviews, monitoring the alignment of observations from the SWT Dashboard and student assessments for face to face and virtual instruction, in order to stay current with student needs and to appropriately plan for the next instructional steps.

Person Responsible	Faith Roberts (robertsf@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our 2021 FSA data, our students demonstrated a decrease in Math proficiency. Our proficiency rate decreased from 76% to 68%.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers provide targeted standards-based as well as data-driven instruction along with the appropriate Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, we will increase proficiency in Math from 68% to 72%.
Monitoring:	Through SWT and data analysis of assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Faith Roberts (robertsf@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use resources such as Duval Math, Ready MAFS, Measuring Up, Freckle, Study Island, and any additional evidence-based materials to remediate foundational skills to increase student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with gaps in their math foundational skills are less likely to demonstrate one year's growth as measured on the FSA Math Assessment. These students need targeted intervention taught through small group instruction or one-on-one instruction to remediate their skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will analyze 2020-21 FSA data, 2019-20 progress monitoring data (iReady, PMAs) and 2020-21 baseline data to identify students in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 support.

Person Responsible	Faith Roberts (robertsf@duvalschools.org)

Tutoring will be made available to our students to improve their achievement and provide support in their specific academic areas of need in math.

Person Responsible	Jeffrey Royal (royalj@duvalschools.org)

Hired a part-time Standards Coach to focus on math needs.

Person Responsible	Faith Roberts (robertsf@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will remediate foundational skills through small-group instruction before, during and/or after school.

Person Responsible	Retha Dixon (viveretter@duvalschool.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

As an additional school-wide improvement priority, we will focus on increasing our results on the 5 Essentials Survey in the areas of Collaborative Practices, Reflective Dialogue, and Professional Development. On the 2021 survey, we decreased in those areas by 30+ points or more. Our goal for 2021-22, is to improve in each area by increasing the identified area to strong where we scored neutral and neutral in the areas we scored week.

We will implement the following action steps:
- Create more time in the schedule for teacher collaboration.
-Create a needs assessment for teachers is ELA, Science, Writing, and Math.
- Identify teacher leaders that can lead professional development with peers.
-Plan professional development for the teachers and staff using data from our needs assessment.
- Provide more opportunities for teachers to participate in Instructional Rounds providing each other with feedback.

We will use Title I funds to hire the following positions:
• Media Specialist - Title I will fund a half position of a media specialist to support our language arts programs including small group instruction, research projects, and STEM initiatives.
• Paraprofessionals - Title I will fund paraprofessionals for small group intervention in our Reading Mastery, Leveled Litteracy Intervention, and Developmental Reading Assessments.

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.

Our school provides a positive school culture by implementing a coherent shared vision among all stakeholders. This vision allows for all stakeholders to feel that their concerns and opinions are being heard and that they are being treated fairly. The administrative team operates within the concept of an open-door policy, wherein faculty and staff are encouraged to share ideas and/or initiatives freely. 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 (PIC), and Content Teams 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.

The School Advisory Committee helps to ensure the voices of stakeholders outside of the school setting are heard. This committee consists of individuals from various backgrounds who play a vital role in decision-making conversations related to school improvement.

CHAMPS, a school-wide behavior plan is implemented in all classrooms, as well as common areas within our school. Generating school and classroom expectations, including having leadership that will follow through consistently with consequences, creates a sense of trust and support from all stakeholders. Being able to align our classroom discipline processes, procedures and consequences with the Student Code of Conduct allows for all stakeholders to be involved which has the greatest effect on positive school culture.

The recognition of students, faculty, and staff is one-way our school community feels valued. Focusing on a character trait each month provides students the ability to be recognized by their teacher in front of other students, staff, and parents. The power of praise promotes an awareness that changes student behaviors and allows for others to see how this character trait aligns with our school expectations. In addition, faculty and staff are recognized by their peers on a weekly basis. Building authentic relationships between staff and all stakeholders with a focus on supporting all students will directly impact our school's success.

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.

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

Principal and AP
Teachers and Support Staff
Parents
Business Partners
Faith-Based Partners
Students

Part V: Budget

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

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