



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>24</b>

## Ruth N. Upson Elementary School

1090 DANCY ST, Jacksonville, FL 32205

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

### 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.**

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, 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
Luster, Shimika	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor's job and responsibilities include providing counseling support to students, teaching classroom guidance lessons, facilitating MRT meetings, provide crisis intervention, provide A.L.E.R.T. training to staff, processing referrals (i.e. gifted, 504, speech).
Stallings, Katherine	Reading Coach	Assist in the school-wide implementation of standards based instruction by coaching, training, and supporting classroom teachers. Participate in the development and facilitation of learning communities for the purpose of professional study and collaborative work. Help teachers understand state and district mandates, the rationale, and how these mandates support improved student achievement. Assist teachers in analyzing school, class, and student data to develop appropriate improvement plans at all levels aligned with district expectations. Participate on the school leadership team to support the school's progress in meeting the District Framework expectations and problem-solve solutions to academic challenges. Participate in professional development opportunities to develop content knowledge and coaching skills to facilitate adult learning. Perform other responsibilities assigned by the principal to support the implementation of standards-based instruction.
Adkins, Stacey	Math Coach	Assist in the school-wide implementation of standards based instruction by coaching, training, and supporting classroom teachers. Participate in the development and facilitation of learning communities for the purpose of professional study and collaborative work. Help teachers understand state and district mandates, the rationale, and how these mandates support improved student achievement. Assist teachers in analyzing school, class, and student data to develop appropriate improvement plans at all levels aligned with district expectations. Participate on the school leadership team to support the school's progress in meeting the District Framework expectations and problem-solve solutions to academic challenges. Participate in professional development opportunities to develop content knowledge and coaching skills to facilitate adult learning. Perform other responsibilities assigned by the principal to support the implementation of standards-based instruction.

**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.

The mission, vision and School Improvement Plan is being communicated to all stakeholders by involving stakeholders in providing input in the creation of all aspects of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). To meet this objective at Ruth N. Upson our School Advisory Council was provided a copy of the previous

plan and was asked to provide input of how to improve our culture and climate, review barriers and decide on school based objectives based on the data. Teachers met during summer discussed barriers, revisit mission, vision, as well, as assist in creating action steps for the School Improvement Plan with academics and pinpoint instructional focus areas.

Once all stakeholders have had an opportunity to provide input, stakeholder will review the draft of the SIP and provide additional input as needed before final copy is submitted. All stakeholders will be emailed a copy of the final SIP. The SIP is placed on the website and in the Parent Resource Room.

**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))

For effective implementation and impact, all instructional personnel and administrators will use the School Improvement Plan as a reference in the development of their Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP). All teachers and administrators participated in the 5 Essential Survey and the data from the survey was used in the development of the School Improvement Plan. Parents and students provided feedback through 5 Essential Survey. The SIP goal will be emailed to each faculty and staff. The SIP will be discussed quarterly and on the agenda for Early Release Meetings.

For additional monitoring, information about the SIP will be noted in the connection, which is our parent newsletter, at least once within the month. In addition we will have quarterly SIP meetings and minutes will be kept reviewed staff and faculty meeting. Minutes will be available upon request.

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	56%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	99%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)



<p align="center"><b>School Grades History</b></p> <p>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	2021-22: A
	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	5	23	21	26	18	32	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	1	2	3	2	2	2	0	0	0	12
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	6	7	1	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	6	12	5	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	7	9	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	7	5	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	17	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	4	11	13	24	9	9	0	0	0	70

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	5	6	8	12	3	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	8

**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	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	3	1	1	3	6	0	0	0	14

**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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	3	1	1	3	6	0	0	0	14

**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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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*	66	48	53	65	50	56	65		
ELA Learning Gains				74			84		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				80			82		
Math Achievement*	71	58	59	67	48	50	68		
Math Learning Gains				73			80		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				79			58		
Science Achievement*	67	52	54	46	59	59	70		
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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	263
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
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	69			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	74			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	79			

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%
FRL	56			

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	66			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	64			
HSP	58			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	65			

**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	66			71			67					
SWD	70			72			76				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53			53			48				4	
HSP	67			80							2	
MUL	62			62							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	77			84			82				4	
FRL	58			63			58				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	65	74	80	67	73	79	46					
SWD	57	74	77	70	81	82	21					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48	72	81	54	74	83	33					
HSP	58			58								
MUL	58			50								
PAC												
WHT	84	77		85	72		72					
FRL	58	68	75	62	76	78	39					

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	65	84	82	68	80	58	70					
SWD	49	77		47	69		58					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	63		49	53		40					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80	96		80	92		92					
FRL	61	79		64	78		65					

**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	72%	47%	25%	54%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	50%	26%	58%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	46%	10%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	71%	59%	12%	59%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	58%	23%	61%	20%
05	2023 - Spring	70%	52%	18%	55%	15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	67%	48%	19%	51%	16%

**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.**

As we reviewed the data, we noticed that while ELA scores across all grade levels have increased, 3rd grade ELA scores have been stagnant over the past 3 years and only approximately half of the students are leaving the grade level having met proficiency.

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

Based on our 2022-2023 data, 4th grade Math showed the greatest decline (3%). However, this group of students went from 54% in 2021-2022 to 81% in 2022-2023.

**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.**

All data points show us performing above the state average. Our lowest gap is 3rd grade ELA (6pts over).

Inconsistency of push in small group interventions due to scheduling constraints and deficiencies related to absences and online instruction during COVID.

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

Our greatest improvement was in 5th grade Science (20%). This was our focus of the 2022-2023 School Improvement Plan. New actions we took included after school tutoring, small group interventions, STEM support from resource teachers, a 3 way split and district support.

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

Focus Area 1: 3rd Grade ELA Proficiency  
Focus Area 2: 3rd Grade Math Proficiency

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

First- 3rd grade ELA and Math  
Second- 2nd grade ELA  
Third- Continue to monitor 5th grade Science (science and writing 2nd year teacher)

**Area of Focus**

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



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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Based on our 2022-2023 FAST data, our students demonstrated a slight proficiency increase (4%) from the 2021-2022 school year.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If teachers provide targeted standards-based as well as data-driven instruction along with the appropriate interventions and enrichments, we will increase our proficiency in ELA by 4%.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area will be monitored through BWT and data analysis of assessments. There will be monthly PLCs and more intentional scheduling WOWs to focus on ELA instruction. With Title I funds Magnetic Reading will be purchased to provide enrichment.

In addition, we will ensure that all students are provided small group instruction and provided Tiered instruction as needed to close foundational gap. Students and teachers will use progress monitoring documents to monitor students progress.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Faith Roberts (robertsf@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.)

Instructional delivery ensures that students are exposed to benchmark- aligned instruction via BEST, FRECKLE, Benchmark Advanced, Magnetic Reading, LLI and UFLI to remediate ELA skills to increase student achievement. Evidence will include student work samples and student assessments.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students with gaps in their ELA background knowledge and foundational skills are less likely to demonstrate understanding of grade level benchmarks and concepts.

**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.

Classroom teachers will analyze data from the FAST ELA assessment and benchmark based checks for understanding to identify students in need of support. Ongoing

**Person Responsible:** Faith Roberts (robertsf@duvalschools.org)

**By When:** May 2024

Monthly PLCs with reading Coach to monitor progress of small group interventions executed by classroom teachers and paraprofessionals.

**Person Responsible:** Katherine Stallings (stallingsk@duvalschools.org)

**By When:** May 2024

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned 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.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of our core content teachers will engage in successful benchmark aligned instructional planning with a focus on student tasks and assessments.

### Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored using the BWT data and sharing with the faculty during Early Release Trainings and in our Weekly Memo.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Faith Roberts (robertsf@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.)

Instructional delivery ensures that students are exposed to benchmark aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments. Evidence will include student work samples and teacher assessments. Teachers will be provided feedback, professional development and support using data from the BWT tool.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

### 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***

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other****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.

We will continue our focus on increasing the results on the 5Essentials Survey in the area of Supportive Environment. Our goal is to improve student peer support for academic work and student-teacher trust measures in our school community.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

We will note gains in our areas of focus primarily through the 5Essentials Survey.

**Monitoring:**

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

Additionally, we will use an academic coach- created interest inventory to use quarterly with students to monitor progress in these areas throughout the year. As a staff, we will focus on cooperative learning based on student data and student-led strategies. Students will be given a pre and post needs assessment as well as the quarterly interest inventories.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Faith Roberts (robertsf@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.)

We will work through collaborative learning in classrooms across campus. As grade levels, we will review student needs and interest forms from students and adjust accordingly for maximum student engagement and involvement. We will continue monthly lunch bunch gatherings, monthly academic celebrations for entire school. We will continue our focus on growth mindset through both guidance lessons and in-class minilessons. We will use both Blooms and Pick My Kid apps to support teacher-family communications in order to raise family awareness and investment in school structures. Additionally, we will be continuing our mentoring partnership with Riverside High School for our at risk fifth grade students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of student input increases investment in the schooling process, and reflects their needs for a positive school environment. Our monthly celebrations build student engagement and interest, as the students want to be celebrated for their growth and achievements throughout the year, not just at the end. The growth mindset lessons help our students become resilient learners, and this shows in the academic risks they are willing to take. The parent communication apps are essential to strengthening our school-home relationships. Our mentor group helps to reach the hardest to reach students on our campus in a way that shows that they are seen and appreciated.

**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).

This section does not pertain to Ruth N. Upson Elementary School.

**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**

Based on 2022-23 data, ELA was identified as a critical need. Students at our school need support with learning the foundational skills of how to read and also understanding the content they are reading. As an Area of Focus, student success in ELA progress will also increase student achievement in other subject areas.

The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2022-2023 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment is as follows: K-24%, 1st - 24%, and 2nd - 50%. We have made instructional changes in 2nd grade to assist with foundational skills and understanding the content.

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

In grades 3-5, we will continue to focus on small group instruction and ensuring that our student remain above 50% proficient in each grade level. Currently 3rd-56%, 4th-77%, and 5th-72% proficient.

## 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

Increase percentage of K-2 students scoring "At Grade Level" or above by 5-6 percentage points.  
Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 5-6 percentage points.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Increase percentage of 3 -5 grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2023-24 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.

## 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.

Our school leadership team, teachers, and district/region content specialist support will review ELA data from district assessments.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Roberts, Faith, robertsf@duvalschools.org

## 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?

**Data Driven Lesson Planning:** Understanding where students are with mastery of standards, using data from informal and formal assessments, planning clear objectives, implementation, and checking for understanding when lesson planning.

**Small Group/Differentiated Instruction:** Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Not all students are on the same level, but all standards must be mastered. Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet students at their level to support their needs.

**Progress Monitoring:** Ensuring whole group lessons, interventions, and assessments are done with fidelity. Checking effectiveness from student data.

**Instructional Reviews with Action Plans:** Collecting data from classrooms in real time and providing immediate and clear feedback for teachers and school leadership teams to work together to ensure effectiveness

**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?

**Data-driven Lesson Planning:** Effective lesson planning requires teachers to determine three essential components such as the objective, the implementation, and a reflection.

**Small Group/Differentiated Instruction:** Small group instruction is the key to data-driven results and is the gateway to meeting the needs of all learners.

**Progress Monitoring:** Student progress monitoring helps teachers evaluate how effective their instruction is, either for individual students or for the entire class.

**Instructional Reviews with Action Plans:** The implementation review is a plan designed to 1) recognize accomplishments, 2) track actions, 3) measure implementation impact, 4) evaluate the plan, 5) determine next steps. It may be used by the school alone or with the assistance of the support lead.

**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
<p>Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with all four strategies listed above. Professional Development during Early Release Days and Common Planning will be essential for Leadership to support teachers. Based on observational data and teacher feedback, PD topics will be set before each Early Release and Common Planning.</p>	<p>Roberts, Faith, robertsf@duvalschools.org</p>
<p>Literacy Coaching- Weekly Common Planning Sessions with K-5 ELA teachers - The school will host teachers by grade level to participate in PLC activities centered around planning standards based lessons, analyzing progress monitoring data, and reviewing student work samples. This work will be coordinated by our lead reading interventionist and supervised by principal and AP. Title I funds will be used to add supplemental personnel or supplemental materials to provide classroom instruction, professional development, specialized instruction and additional support to increase student achievement. During Common Planning and individual teacher data chats, specific data pertaining to ELA reading and student success will be discussed and analyzed to ensure we are monitoring progress.</p>	<p>Stallings, Katherine, stallingsk@duvalschools.org</p>
<p>Assessment- Our reading interventionist will provide small group interventions using programs such as Leveled Literacy Interventions and Magentic Reading K-5 selected based on diagnostic data collected. The reading interventionist will also work to provide reading assessments to their students as well as supporting teachers to provide individualized assessments such as Level Literacy Intervention, and Phonics For Reading,</p>	<p>Stallings, Katherine, stallingsk@duvalschools.org</p>
<p>Give immediate feedback on any observations/walkthroughs conducted by school leadership,district content specialists, and district leadership.</p>	<p>Roberts, Faith, robertsf@duvalschools.org</p>

## 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.

- Email SIP to families
- Provides information to SAC and PTA
- Post SIP on the Website
- <https://dcps.duvalschools.org/Domain/8607>

**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))

[https:// duvalschools.org/ruthupson](https://duvalschools.org/ruthupson)

The faculty and staff at Ruth Upson are committed to building positive relationships with students and parents on a daily basis. We have planned several events throughout the year that will engage and empower parents with strategies and resources to ensure students and parents success (Literacy Night, Math Night, Science Night).

During our monthly SAC and PTA meetings, representatives from the faculty and administration share data and other pertinent information needed in order to ensure the success of the school.

Emails, automated calls, and weekly newsletters are sent out to notify parents of different events that are happening at Ruth N. Upson.

FOCUS- The grade portal that is updated weekly allow parents to view their student’s weekly progress.

**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)**

ESE- ESE teachers will provided accommodations to students based on their IEP, while providing push in support when possible. The push in model allows students to receive instruction from their general education teacher, while receiving necessary support from the ESE teacher. This also maximizes instructional time and minimizes disruptions that may hinder students throughout the day.

Common Planning - Time is strategically planned so that General Educator and ESE Teachers have an opportunity to collaborate more frequently. CP is more strategic with the instructional coaches.

Professional Development- Teachers received professional development during the summer to expand their expertise in their content.

Consistency- Minimal changes with organizational structure, which allows teachers to build on their previous experience.

**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))**

N/A

**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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>



## Budget Approval

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

No