

Hendry County Schools

Edward A. Upthegrove Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Edward A. Upthegrove Elementary

280 N MAIN ST, Labelle, FL 33935

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=8&sc_id=1171294169

Demographics

Principal: Karra Rivas

Start Date for this Principal: 8/11/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Hendry 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	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Edward A. Upthegrove Elementary

280 N MAIN ST, Labelle, FL 33935

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=8&sc_id=1171294169

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 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	71%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hendry 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.

Upthegrove Elementary School provides students with an optimal learning environment to create and develop lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All members of Upthegrove Elementary School are expected to Be Respectful, Be Responsible, Be Safe, Be Prepared and Be Present in order to create the expected learning environment.

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
Rivas, Karra	Principal	
McVay, Catherine	School Counselor	
Cooper, Pamela	Assistant Principal	
Tack, Sasha	Instructional Coach	
Mayo, Kerry	Teacher, K-12	
Stuhlman, Connie	Teacher, K-12	
Huckabee, Statira	Teacher, K-12	
Melton, Victoria	Teacher, K-12	
Vicas, Sara	Teacher, K-12	
Bowen, Charlene	Teacher, K-12	
Whited, Lori	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/11/2020, Karra Rivas

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.*

3

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

34

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	75	66	86	77	66	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	456
Attendance below 90 percent	6	4	1	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
	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	0	0	0	2	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Tuesday 8/11/2020

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	68	96	86	73	91	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	13	17	16	10	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	0	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	28	31	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	1	0	6	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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

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	68	96	86	73	91	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	13	17	16	10	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	0	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	28	31	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	1	0	6	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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

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	50%	50%	57%	48%	44%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	54%	58%	47%	48%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	50%	53%	36%	45%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	56%	63%	47%	48%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	62%	62%	57%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	45%	51%	49%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	44%	53%	46%	42%	51%

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	39%	47%	-8%	58%	-19%
	2018	43%	44%	-1%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
	2018	48%	47%	1%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	55%	47%	8%	56%	-1%
	2018	44%	45%	-1%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	52%	-6%	62%	-16%
	2018	40%	48%	-8%	62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	57%	-3%	64%	-10%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	48%	53%	-5%	60%	-12%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	61%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	41%	3%	53%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	46%	43%	3%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	30	24	18	26	28						
ELL	35	60	50	49	64	47	36				
HSP	47	61	56	51	65	50	37				
WHT	55	53		50	56		59				
FRL	49	60	50	48	61	52	41				
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	19	13		27	38						
ELL	28	44	33	40	59	46	14				
HSP	44	50	45	50	58	54	47				
WHT	50	48		52	61	55	55				
FRL	44	50	42	48	57	55	45				
2017 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	23	27	14	20	38	38	33				
ELL	30	36	20	35	57	50	20				
HSP	46	48	36	48	58	50	43				
WHT	56	51	40	47	55		62				
FRL	44	45	36	41	57	42	39				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
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	54
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.

Science was the lowest performance category with 45% of students scoring proficient (Levels 3, 4, 5)

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

Math Learning Gains for the Bottom Quartile went down by 7%. Science went down by 3%.

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.

Math Achievement Overall had a 12% gap between the school average and the state average. One contributing factor was the delay of the Math adoption. There was very little focus on Math as an area of focus in the 2018-19 school year.

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

Overall Achievement in ELA increased 5% and the Bottom Quartile Gains in ELA increased 5% while the overall Learning Gains in ELA increased by 9%. We implemented schoolwide intervention for all

students using Phonics for Reading. Leveled Literacy Intervention by Fountas and Pinnell and a strong implementation of Expeditionary Learning Curriculum in grades 2-5 for the 2018-19.

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

The number of students scoring Level I in FSA in at least one subject is an area of concern. Another area of concern is the high number of students with greater than 10% absenteeism.

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

1. Science Performance
2. Math Performance and Math Gains.
3. Decrease in the number of students scoring Level 1 on FSA.
4. Decrease in the number of students with less than 90% attendance.
5. Continuation of improvement in ELA Performance and Gains.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: There was a 4% gain in students scoring at levels 3, 4, and 5 in 4th grade from their scores the previous year and a 7% gain in students scoring at levels 3, 4, and 5 in 5th grade from their scores the previous year. We want to ensure that we continue to see this growth from year to year in ELA.

Measurable Outcome: We would like to see an increase from 50% to 55% of students scoring Levels 3, 4, and 5 for 2021 assessment. We would also like to see an increase from 28% to 33% of our SWD proficient in ELA for the 2021 assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Karra Rivas (rivask@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Small Group Instruction in Reading focused on Area of need. Students who are more than 1 year below level will work to close their learning gaps in phonics and phonemic awareness first then comprehension. Students who are less than 1 year below level will focus primarily on comprehension, fluency and vocabulary development through the Leveled Literacy Intervention program by Fountas and Pinnell. Students that are on-level and above will continue to practice their Reading through Accelerated Reader and will work to improve their vocabulary and comprehension through a variety of activities identified by the classroom teacher. Students will have a 30 minute time daily of small group instruction.

Students in grades K-2 will utilize the Reading Horizons curriculum for Phonics Instruction daily and to help with the acquisition of Foundational Reading Skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students that are working well below level must close their gaps in order to achieve at the expected grade level or performance. Therefore, students will be identified using IReady and STAR Reading assessments and provided intervention if necessary.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide intensive fluency and comprehension or phonics/phonemic awareness groups for all grade levels based on individual data from IReady and STAR.
2. Students in Grades K-2 will use Reading Horizons for their Reading Skills Lessons daily.
3. IXL will be used to supplement Reading Instruction for all students in grades 1-5.
4. Students in grades 3 and 5 will use the IReady LAFS Instruction books for Comprehension, Fluency and Vocabulary Development.
5. Supplemental materials in ELA will be utilized to help close the gaps in learning for all students.

Person Responsible Karra Rivas (rivask@hendry-schools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Decrease the number of students with less than 90% attendance rate in order for students to learn, they must be at school.
Measurable Outcome:	We would like to decrease the number of students with less than 90% attendance rate to 75 students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karra Rivas (rivask@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitoring daily attendance and making phone calls to targeted students. Monitoring daily attendance and rewarding perfect attendance by the week for targeted students. Monitoring weekly attendance rewarding improved attendance quarterly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our data indicated that 86 students in 2018-19 (17%) of the student population were absent 10% or more of the time and research indicates that they have a significantly increased risk of not graduating if this continues to occur.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Daily monitor targeted student attendance and make phone calls to parents regarding the attendance.

Person Responsible Karra Rivas (rivask@hendry-schools.net)

2. Monitor daily attendance and reward targeted students with an Eagle Earning for perfect attendance each week.

Person Responsible Karra Rivas (rivask@hendry-schools.net)

3. Monitor weekly attendance and reward improved attendance each quarter for targeted students.

Person Responsible Karra Rivas (rivask@hendry-schools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Science Performance - All students will participate in a Science FAIR annually. 5th grade students will produce individual projects for this event. 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students will participate in PENDA Learning for Science and will be expected to have 30 minutes of usage weekly and a minimum of 2 objectives mastered each week. Every grade level will use Science Spin and 4th grade students will use Super Science as well to inspire interest in Science with all students.

2. Math Performance - All students will participate in the Math Curriculum Pearson Envision Math. Students in grades 3 - 5 will participate in STAR Math assessments Quarterly to monitor student performance outcomes and identify individual needs. Students in 4th and 5th grades will use Freckle Math to focus on improved performance of grade level objectives.

3) School Safety - In order to improve communication with parents and make the student dismissal procedure more safe, we will continue to use Pikmykid which will allow parents to communicate with the school about dismissal requests and also communicate with the teacher about their child through an app on their phone.

4) Increasing Technology - Every classroom was equipped with a Promethean Board during the 2019-20 school year. We will continue to improve our use of the technology with teachers being trained in the use of the boards.

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.

At Upthegrove Elementary School, we will have a number of events scheduled throughout the year to include parents, families and other community stakeholders in the school's mission and to support the needs of students. Some of those activities are: 1) Quarterly Parent/Teacher conferences scheduled from 4:30 - 6:00 p.m. to meet the need for parents to be able to come after work. 2) Open House/Spaghetti Dinner that will focus on acclimating families to our school and their child's classroom. 3) Title I Parent Meeting to explain our Title I focus and listen to concerns for improving academic offerings for their children. 4) Family Reading Night where families will be invited to come to school and participate in an event to promote literacy for all students. 5) Science FAIR and STEAM Night where families may come participate in a variety of activities with their children to explore Science, Technology, Engineering, Art, and Math opportunities that are available at Upthegrove Elementary. 6) Implementation of Pikmykid which will improve the safety and security of students on our campus and make the dismissal process much more

functional by allowing parents to make changes to their child's dismissal through an app on their phone. We will also utilize this system to communicate with parents as well. The principal and the admin team will utilize the Blackboard Connect callout system to communicate with parents about important reminders and upcoming activities at the school on a regular basis in English and Spanish.

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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00