

Hendry County Schools

Edward A. Upthegrove Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 8/10/2020

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)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	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	72%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rivas, Karra	Principal	
Cooper, Pamela	Assistant Principal	
Stuhlman, Connie	Teacher, K-12	
Huckabee, Statira	Teacher, K-12	
Vicas, Sara	Other	
Bowen, Charlene	Teacher, K-12	
Mayo, Kerry	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/10/2020, 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

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

526

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

5

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

6

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	78	90	74	70	83	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	472
Attendance below 90 percent	27	42	31	29	25	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	2	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	2	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	32	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	1	10	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	2	3	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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

Friday 9/3/2021

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	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	

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	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	0

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				50%	50%	57%	45%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	54%	58%	49%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	50%	53%	41%	43%	48%
Math Achievement				51%	56%	63%	50%	53%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	62%	62%	59%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	45%	51%	54%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				45%	44%	53%	48%	44%	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	39%	47%	-8%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	47%	8%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	46%	52%	-6%	62%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	57%	-3%	64%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	53%	-5%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	44%	41%	3%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Kg-5th - iReady Diagnostic ELA & Math- Fall, Winter, Spring
 5th - Performance Matters Science- Fall, Winter, Spring

		Grade 1			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		14	34	68
	Economically Disadvantaged		14	34	68
	Students With Disabilities		14	29	57
	English Language Learners		23	23	62
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		14	24	70
	Economically Disadvantaged		14	24	70
	Students With Disabilities		29	14	43
	English Language Learners		15	8	62

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25	42	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	42	64
	Students With Disabilities	25	25	63
	English Language Learners	25	21	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9	14	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	14	50
	Students With Disabilities	13	0	50
	English Language Learners	8	14	43
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23	34	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	34	62
	Students With Disabilities	24	24	53
	English Language Learners	8	17	42
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	17	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	17	32
	Students With Disabilities	12	18	35
	English Language Learners	0	17	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17	28	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	28	41
	Students With Disabilities	25	23	23
	English Language Learners	4	28	28
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	29	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	29	47
	Students With Disabilities	25	23	31
	English Language Learners	0	16	36
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23	33	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	33	42
	Students With Disabilities	20	19	28
	English Language Learners	17	8	17
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	34	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	34	45
	Students With Disabilities	7	19	22
	English Language Learners	25	33	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	4	4	12
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	0	9
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	14
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	23	25		31	42		38				
ELL	31	40		40	47		17				
HSP	38	39	42	42	48	50	25				
WHT	52	76		52	65		44				
FRL	36	43	30	39	40	30	22				
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				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	361
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	58
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	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

For the ELL population, ELA and Math proficiency is higher in grades K-2 than in grades 3-5. This trend also occurs with the ESE population.

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

Less than 1% of our 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade ELL subgroup scored a 3, 4 or 5 on the 20-21 ELA state assessment.
 30% of our 5th grade students scored a 3, 4, or 5 on the 20-21 Science state assessment.

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

In Science, grades K-4 need to have more rigorous instruction so students have a good foundation in the science content before they reach 5th grade.

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

Due to school closures from COVID-19, our school showed no improvement. Our scores declined in proficiency rates from the 2019 assessments in all subjects.

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

The school had to close in March 2020 for the school year due to COVID-19 and then in the 20-21 school year we were not 100% on campus.

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

1. We are implementing differentiated small groups for all grade levels in Reading for all students four times a week.
2. The ELL Resource Teacher will create weekly short phonemic awareness, phonics, and

vocabulary instructional videos to share with classroom teachers to use as a supplemental resource.

3. All students will receive instruction using the Savvas/Realize Math curriculum. They will also receive instruction using the iReady Math, Freckle Math, and IXL programs, tailored to their needs.
4. Teachers will provide instruction using Florida Science Studies Weekly (K-5), Penda Science (3-5), and Savvas/Envision Science curriculum (5).

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.

Ongoing training will be given to all teachers with the Benchmark Performance Reading Curriculum, Core Connections Writing, Penda Science, iReady Reading/Math, and Freckle Math.

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

1. All 3rd & 4th grade students that scored a one on the 20-21 FSA assessment, will receive additional intervention time to work on areas of need three times a week.
2. Teachers will conduct small intervention groups four times a week with those below grade level.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

There was a decrease in number of 3rd-5th grade students scoring a 3, 4, or 5 on the 20-21 ELA state assessment from 50% to 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase in the number of 3-5 grade students scoring levels 3, 4, or 5 on the 21-22 ELA state assessment from 41% to 50%.

Monitoring:

We will use the iReady Diagnostic and STAR assessments to monitor progress. We will also complete the crosswalk to identify students who are close to reaching predicted proficiency and provide targeted instruction before the statewide assessment. For monitoring Writing, teachers will provide monthly student writing samples and complete monthly scoring analysis.

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 one year below grade level will first work to close their learning gaps in Phonics and Phonemic Awareness. Students who are less than one year below grade level will focus primarily on Vocabulary Development, Fluency, and Comprehension. Students who are on grade level or above will continue to practice reading skills through the Accelerated Reader and iReady programs and will work to improve their vocabulary and comprehension through a variety of activities identified by the classroom teachers. All students will have a 30 minutes daily of small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Students who 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 interventions as necessary.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide small group instruction 4x per week for all grade levels based on individual data from iReady and STAR assessments.

Person Responsible

Karra Rivas (rivask@hendry-schools.net)

Students in grades K-1 will use Heggerty curriculum for Phonemic Awareness.

Person Responsible

Karra Rivas (rivask@hendry-schools.net)

Students in grades K-5 will use the Building Vocabulary curriculum for vocabulary development.

Person Responsible

Karra Rivas (rivask@hendry-schools.net)

Teachers of grades 2-5 will attend professional development opportunities in Core Connections Writing.

Person Responsible

Karra Rivas (rivask@hendry-schools.net)

Students in grades K-5 will complete monthly writing samples, which teachers will score and analyze.

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

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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 16.4% of our population qualifies for the ELL program. Less than 1% of our 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade ELL subgroup scored a 3, 4 or 5 on the 20-21 ELA state assessment.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the number of 3rd-5th grade English Language Learners subgroup scoring a 3, 4 or 5 on the 21-22 ELA state assessment from less than 1% to 25%.

Monitoring: We will use the iReady Diagnostic and STAR assessments to monitor progress. We will also complete the crosswalk to identify students who are close to reaching predicted proficiency and provide targeted instruction before the statewide assessment. For monitoring Writing, teachers will provide monthly student writing samples and complete scoring analysis.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Small group targeted instruction based on the Access for ELLs assessment data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students who 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 as necessary.

Action Steps to Implement

The ELL Resource Teacher will work with all English Language Learners in a small group setting 4x per week, 30 minutes per session, targeting areas of need as shown by the Access for ELLs assessment.

Person Responsible Kerry Mayo (mayok@hendry-schools.net)

The ELL Resource Teacher will create short phonemic awareness, phonics, and vocabulary instructional videos to share with classroom teachers to use as a supplemental resource.

Person Responsible Kerry Mayo (mayok@hendry-schools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: There was a decrease in the number of 3rd-5th grade students scoring a 3, 4, or 5 on the 20-21 Math State Assessment from 50% to 43%.

Measurable Outcome: Increase in the number of 3rd-5th grade students scoring levels 3, 4, or 5 on the 21-22 Math State Assessment from 43% to 50%.

Monitoring: We will use the iReady Diagnostic and STAR assessments to monitor progress. We will also complete the crosswalk to identify students who are close to reaching predicted proficiency and provide targeted instruction before the statewide assessment.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: All students will receive instruction using the Savvas/Realize Math curriculum. They will also receive instruction using the iReady Math, Freckle Math, and IXL programs, tailored to their needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students who 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 Math Assessments and provided interventions as necessary.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will attend professional development from iReady and Freckle on how to implement these programs with fidelity.

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

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: There was a decrease in the number of 3rd-5th grade students scoring a 3, 4, or 5 on the 20-21 Science state assessment from 45% to 30%.

Measurable Outcome: Increase in the number of 3rd-5th grade students scoring levels 3, 4, or 5 on the 21-22 Science state assessment from 30% to 50%.

Monitoring: We will use the Performance Matters Science assessments to monitor progress in Science.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will provide instruction using Florida Science Studies Weekly (K-5), Penda Science (3-5), and Savvas/Envision Science curriculum (5).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students who 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 the Performance Matters Assessments and provided interventions as necessary.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will use the Penda Science program at least 30 minutes with a minimum of two objectives mastered per week.

Person Responsible: Pamela Cooper (cooperp@hendry-schools.net)

Florida Science Studies Weekly will be used in all grades as part of the science curriculum.

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

All students will participate in a school wide science fair. 5th grade students will produce individual projects for this event.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

We will monitor our school-wide discipline data monthly to identify trends using the district FOCUS program.

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.

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 are 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 to 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 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. 7. The teachers, principal and leadership team will utilize the Class Dojo and Remind systems to communicate with parents about important reminders and upcoming activities at the school on a regular basis in English and Spanish. 8. PBIS will be implemented to enhance positive culture and behaviors. Students will earn Eagle Earnings by following the schoolwide expectations and spend their earnings for weekly celebrations.

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

Stakeholders are the school administrators, leadership team, faculty, staff, students, parents, families, volunteers, and PTO members. School administrators, leadership team members, faculty, and staff work together to promote a safe, caring learning environment and collaborate with students, parents, families, volunteers, and PTO members to ensure a positive culture.