
Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 0 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 20 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 23 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 25 |

Edward A. Upthegrove Elementary

280 N MAIN ST, Labelle, FL 33935

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

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.

Upthegrove Elementary School provides students with an optimal learning environment to create leaders 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, 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 |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Rivas, Karra | Principal | Monitor evaluations, instruction, support |
| Cassidy, Heather | Assistant Principal | Monitor behavior, evaluations, instruction, support |
| Tack, Sasha | Reading Coach | Professional learning, teacher support, instructional coaching |
| Deerey, Aarika | School Counselor | Student services, counseling, testing coordinator, new teacher support |
| Mayo, Kerry | ELL Compliance Specialist | Student services, testing |

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 Admin team collaborated with the district leaders to review the district and school data. The data was shared with Leadership Team and full staff. The Leadership Team met to create our school goals. We will be reviewing the SIP with our SAC at the first meeting in September.

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))

We will monitor the data every trimester following the State Assessment schedule. School Leadership Team will review data and make adjustments as needed. Team leads will review data with grade level teams to make informative instructional decisions.

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 2023-24 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 |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 74% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

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 | 16 | 24 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 1 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 5 | 10 | 23 | 3 | 15 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 |

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 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |

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 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 10 | 24 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 7 | 25 | 40 | 13 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |

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 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Students retained two or more times | 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 | 10 | 24 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 7 | 25 | 40 | 13 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |

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 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Students retained two or more times | 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* | 44 | 42 | 53 | 46 | 46 | 56 | 42 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 57 | | | 50 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 43 | | | 43 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 52 | 50 | 59 | 52 | 49 | 50 | 45 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 55 | | | 53 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 49 | | | 50 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 39 | 43 | 54 | 29 | 53 | 59 | 33 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 61 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 59 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 40 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 57 | 53 | 59 | 72 | | | 45 | | |

* 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) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 46 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 230 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 50 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 403 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| 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 | 32 | Yes | 4 | |
| ELL | 39 | Yes | 2 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 40 | Yes | 1 | |
| FRL | 43 | | | |

| 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 | 39 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 38 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | | | |

| 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% |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | | | |
| FRL | 48 | | | |

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 | 44 | | | 52 | | | 39 | | | | | 57 |
| SWD | 17 | | | 20 | | | 31 | | | | 5 | 70 |
| ELL | 36 | | | 50 | | | 30 | | | | 5 | 57 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | | | 57 | | | 36 | | | | 5 | 59 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 42 | | | 43 | | | 41 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 40 | | | 49 | | | 32 | | | | 5 | 55 |

| 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 | 46 | 57 | 43 | 52 | 55 | 49 | 29 | | | | | 72 |
| SWD | 23 | 24 | | 37 | 45 | | | | | | | 64 |
| ELL | 33 | 43 | 31 | 38 | 40 | 42 | 6 | | | | | 72 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 54 | 43 | 50 | 50 | 54 | 22 | | | | | 73 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 49 | 61 | | 58 | 64 | | 56 | | | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 54 | 38 | 46 | 53 | 49 | 26 | | | | | 75 |

| 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 | 42 | 50 | 43 | 45 | 53 | 50 | 33 | | | | | 45 |
| SWD | 23 | 25 | | 31 | 42 | | 38 | | | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 40 | | 40 | 47 | | 17 | | | | | 45 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 39 | 42 | 42 | 48 | 50 | 25 | | | | | 48 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | 76 | | 52 | 65 | | 44 | | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 43 | 30 | 39 | 40 | 30 | 22 | | | | | 43 |

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 | 48% | 41% | 7% | 54% | -6% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 43% | 12% | 58% | -3% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 37% | 36% | 1% | 50% | -13% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 37% | 10% | 59% | -12% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 68% | 45% | 23% | 61% | 7% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 48% | 35% | 13% | 55% | -7% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 37% | 31% | 6% | 51% | -14% |

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.

Last year's FAST ELA data results showed the lowest performance in 3rd grade at 38% proficiency. There were multiple students with attendance issues and 87% students had a reading deficiency at the beginning of the year. The same cohort has a 34% proficiency in ELA in 2021-2022, and in the 2020-2021 they learned virtually.

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

Last year's FAST ELA data results showed the lowest performance in 3rd grade at 38% proficiency which is a decline from the previous year which was 44% proficiency. We had one teacher that retired in December, one first year teacher, and one teacher was moved to the ESE self-contained classroom and her classroom was taken over by a retired teacher.

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.

In 3rd grade the State ELA Proficiency is 59% compared to the school's 38% proficiency in ELA. There were multiple students with attendance issues and 87% students had a reading deficiency at the beginning of the year. In addition to, We had one teacher that retired in December, one first year

teacher, and one teacher was moved to the ESE self-contained classroom and her classroom was taken over by a retired teacher.

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

4th grade showed the most improvement in ELA from 45% proficient to 55% proficient. The team differentiated instruction which included the use of a supplemental resources to focus on student specific deficiencies based on diagnostic assessment. In addition, the team included explicit instruction.

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

Our potential area of concern is attendance. According to the EWS data, 81 students are identified as having missed 10% or more days of the school year.

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

1. Proficiency school-wide in ELA
2. Focus on differentiated instruction for 3rd & 4th grade ELA
3. Focus on phonics instruction for Kg-2nd

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

According to the FAST data, our SWD are at 39% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We want to increase our SWD from 39% to a minimum of 41% proficiency in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

We will use the FAST, iReady and their IEP goals to guide instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karra Rivas (rivask@hendry-schools.net)

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.)

Explicit and systematic, scaffolded differentiated instruction in small group settings will be implemented utilizing UFLI, iReady toolbox and FCRR.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We will focus on individualized learning goals and deficits.

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.

UFLI training will be provided for all Kg-2nd teachers.

Person Responsible: Sasha Tack (tacks@hendry-schools.net)

By When: Initial training is set for August 1st and then we will have on-going training throughout the year.

Explicit and systematic, scaffolded differentiated instruction training through Huddle Up Hendry.

Person Responsible: Sasha Tack (tacks@hendry-schools.net)

By When: August 3rd & 4th and then on-going

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

According to the FAST data, our ELL are at 38% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We want to increase our ELL from 38% to a minimum of 41% proficiency in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

We will use the FAST, iReady and their WIDA Access for ELLs data to guide instruction. In addition, we will use the Elevation program to monitor, and plan for "next step" approaches to help implement ELL strategies in the grade level classrooms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karra Rivas (rivask@hendry-schools.net)

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.)

Explicit and systematic, scaffold differentiated instruction in small group settings will be implemented utilizing UFLI, iReady toolbox and FCRR.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We will focus on individualized learning goals and deficits.

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.

UFLI training will be provided for all Kg-2nd teachers.

Person Responsible: Sasha Tack (tacks@hendry-schools.net)

By When: Initial training is set for August 1st and then we will have on-going training throughout the year.

Explicit and systematic, scaffolded differentiated instruction training through Huddle Up Hendry.

Person Responsible: Sasha Tack (tacks@hendry-schools.net)

By When: August 3rd & 4th and then on-going

#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.

According to our EWS data, 81 students had 10% or more missed school days.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will decrease the number of absentee students from 81 to 51.

Monitoring:

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

Students will be keeping a daily attendance log in their data binder. Teachers and administrators will track attendance in FOCUS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Cassidy (cassidyh@hendry-schools.net)

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.)

Leader in Me program is being implemented to increase student leadership and responsibility.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Leader in Me "is the proven personal-leadership system based on timeless principles of effectiveness."

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.

Lighthouse Training with the Leadership Team

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

By When: July 20, 2023

Staff Training for the implementation of Leader in Me program.

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

By When: July 26-27, 2023 with ongoing support throughout the school year.

#4. 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.

After reviewing 2023 ELA FAST results, the leadership team has identified ELA proficiency as an area of need due to the lack of growth achieved.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our ELA focus for grades 3-5 will be to increase our ELA proficiency score from 46% to 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Our leadership team will facilitate data meetings with the staff following progress monitoring testing. Weekly PLC meetings will continue throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karra Rivas (rivask@hendry-schools.net)

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 have weekly data chats, reading groups 4 days a week, daily intervention time, instructional videos for reading, and on-going professional development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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, STAR and/or Cambium Reading assessments and provided interventions as necessary.

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.

Plan Leadership PLC meetings according to the testing schedule.

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

By When: We will have a schedule that will be planned by September 8, 2023.

Plan Leadership PLC meetings according to the testing schedule.

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

By When: We will have a schedule that will be planned by September 8, 2023.

Disseminate the data to grade-level teams during PLCs.

Person Responsible: Sasha Tack (tacks@hendry-schools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

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

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

34% of students in kindergarten through 2nd grade, based on the 2022-23 end of year iReady data, are not on track to score level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment. (Kg: 32%, 1st: 20%, 2nd: 50%)

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

54% of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide FAST assessment, standardized ELA assessment. (3rd: 61%, 4th: 47%, 5th: 60%)

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 the number of K-2 students scoring on grade level on the 23-24 ELA state assessment from 66% to 75%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Increase in the number of 3rd-5th grade students scoring levels 3, 4, or 5 on the 23-24 ELA state assessment from 46% to 50%.

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.

We will use the iReady Diagnostic, STAR, and Cambium 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

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Rivas, Karra, rivask@hendry-schools.net

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?

We will continue 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 40 minutes Monday-Thursday small group instruction.

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?

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, STAR and/or Cambium Reading assessments and provided interventions as necessary.

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 |
|--|---|
| Create the master schedule for Reading Groups for all grade levels and schedule the teachers/paras for each group. | Rivas, Karra, rivask@hendry-schools.net |
| Provide professional learning as needed | Tack, Sasha, tacks@hendry-schools.net |
| Identify resources to be used | Rivas, Karra, rivask@hendry-schools.net |
| Create groups based off of data | Rivas, Karra, rivask@hendry-schools.net |

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.

Dissemination of the SIP's and the Schoolwide Plan is done by: Posting on the school website, through SAC meetings and the annual Title I Parent Meeting. A summary of the SIP in English and Spanish is provided at the annual Title I meeting for parents.

SIPS are also discussed at other Parent meetings such as PTO meetings. All SIPS are finalized and board approved and are then published on the state website.

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))

Parent and family engagement plans are created by all stakeholders at each school. Parents, teachers, leaders and community members collaborate and provide input on the implementation of the parent and family engagement plan based on the comprehensive needs assessment and surveys. These plans are also a topic on the SAC agendas and approved by the SAC committee. Goals are designed to build positive relationships between school personnel and parents. Best practices and strategies are shared with families during literary nights, or math and science nights to create a culture of engagement and improved student achievement. These best practices directly align with the district strategic plan and the school-wide improvement plan goals. The Parent and Family Engagement plan will be posted in English and Spanish.

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)

This answer will be individualized, but examples would be title I resource teachers and paras to provide extra support. Programs purchased such as iready, nearpod, brainpop, and Renaissance as supplemental interventions. Reading Coaches, Professional Development, data based or standards based planning with teachers, Leader In Me.

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))

Title I provides reading resource teachers, paraprofessionals, supplemental programs and supplies, and prek programs. Title III provides a district resource teacher, dictionaries and other supplies, elevation platform. Title II provides reading coaches, professional development - UFLI, etc., funding for standards based planning and data planning. Title V provides LIM PD and supplies. Title IX provides funding for the homeless after school program. Title I Part C (migrant) provides advocates for recruitment and advocacy, supplies for migrant students and after school tutoring for migrant students. SAI funds (now called education enrichment funds) provide after school tutoring and supplemental intervention supplies. Food service provides snacks for after school programs. School safety funds are utilized for implementation of safety teams and hardening of schools to keep all students and staff safe for the most conducive learning environment.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

We use Suite 360 and our counselor provides SEL lessons by grade level in classrooms.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We use PBIS with Leader In Me here at UES. PBIS/LIM is used to implement classroom procedures and common expectations across the school.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Weekly professional learning during PLCs in addition to monthly 1/2 day PLCs. Professional learning includes: UFLI training, LIM, data meetings, ELL, curriculum training.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Parent meetings are held for inclusion students, and vpk students. School visits are coordinated for daycare students between elementary schools and daycare facilities. Kindergarten Roundup happens on one evening where parents receive transition strategies and best practices from prek to kindergarten. Summer packets are given to prek students to assist with the transition to kindergarten.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.B. | Area of Focus: -- Select below --: | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

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

Yes