Meadow Park Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Meadow Park Elementary School

3131 LAKE VIEW BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33948

http://yourcharlotteschools.net/mpe

Demographics

Principal: Lauren Elek

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (44%) 2014-15: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Charlotte 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

Meadow Park Elementary School

3131 LAKE VIEW BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33948

http://yourcharlotteschools.net/mpe

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 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	37%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Charlotte 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.

Know Our Kids, Grow Our Kids, ALL of Them.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together We Succeed Through Leadership.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Loge, Matt	Principal	To develop a school wide instructional plan where ALL students' academic needs are met and develop a continuous improvement system to ensure frequent monitoring and evaluation of students data and effective institutional practice. -Develop an effective master schedule to ensure instructional time is valued -Observe and evaluate teacher practice -Create systems and procedures to ensure the Continuous Improvement Model in embedded into the culture of the school -Develop and create a school community which fosters and encourages student and faculty growth
Bishop, Bo	School Counselor	To oversee the MTSS process and to ensure the Multi-Tiered Support System is fluid, organized, and structured to ensure students are appropriately identified and provided with the necessary systems of academic and behavioral support.
Elek, Lauren	Assistant Principal	Assist the Principal in creating a school wide academic plan to address the academic needs of the school. She will also assist Principal in monitoring the effectiveness of instructional practices and the status and growth of all students. -Develop an effective master schedule to ensure instructional time is valued -Observe and evaluate teacher practice -Create systems and procedures to ensure the Continuous Improvement Model in embedded into the culture of the school -Develop and create a school community which fosters and encourages student and faculty growth
Probst, John	Instructional Coach	Provide instructional support and coaching to instructional staff to assist in the implementation of best practices in the area of reading, math, and writing. Provide model lessons for instructional staff in reading, math, and writing. Provide assistance to instructional staff in the area of student data and monitor the tracking of student data and overall data for the school.
Taylor, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	

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	121	107	117	112	107	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	19	12	8	12	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
41

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/13/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	11	10	6	6	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	9	8	3	6	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	21	19	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	47	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119

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	2	3	0	14	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	11	10	6	6	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	9	8	3	6	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	21	19	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	47	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119

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	2	3	0	14	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	59%	62%	57%	54%	60%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	57%	58%	50%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	50%	53%	41%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	60%	63%	63%	61%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	54%	62%	56%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	42%	51%	46%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	54%	53%	41%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	121 (0)	107 (0)	117 (0)	112 (0)	107 (0)	118 (0)	682 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	19 (11)	12 (10)	8 (6)	12 (6)	12 (11)	13 (13)	76 (57)
One or more suspensions	0 (9)	0 (8)	0 (3)	0 (6)	0 (13)	0 (10)	0 (49)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (21)	0 (19)	0 (17)	0 (57)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (26)	15 (47)	25 (46)	40 (119)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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	
03	2019	67%	69%	-2%	58%	9%	
	2018	57%	63%	-6%	57%	0%	
Same Grade Comparison		10%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	44%	57%	-13%	58%	-14%	
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%	
Same Grade Comparison		-6%					
Cohort Comparison		-13%					
05	2019	57%	56%	1%	56%	1%	
	2018	50%	56%	-6%	55%	-5%	
Same Grade Comparison		7%					
Cohort Comparison		7%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	69%	70%	-1%	62%	7%	
	2018	61%	69%	-8%	62%	-1%	
Same Grade Comparison		8%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	53%	60%	-7%	64%	-11%	
	2018	48%	61%	-13%	62%	-14%	
Same Grade Comparison		5%					
Cohort Comparison		-8%					
05	2019	50%	56%	-6%	60%	-10%	
	2018	46%	62%	-16%	61%	-15%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison		2%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	61%	52%	9%	53%	8%	
	2018	61%	63%	-2%	55%	6%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
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	37	35	33	41	46	50	45				

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
ELL	47	50		67	90						
BLK	45	35		41	59		46				
HSP	61	57	50	62	62	53	52				
MUL	69	79		65	58		69				
WHT	60	49	35	61	57	52	67				
FRL	50	47	39	54	53	46	55				
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	34	46	48	32	30	27	33				
BLK	41	27		44	30		70				
HSP	52	42		57	48		64				
MUL	64	63		73	74						
WHT	58	52	49	55	39	27	68				
FRL	48	43	40	49	37	23	61				
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	24	32	37	28	47	39	30				
BLK	52	45		56	43						
HSP	55	59		74	75		40				
MUL	60	31		79	69						
WHT	54	50	40	57	53	51	39				
FRL	44	43	40	52	53	43	33				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	62
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
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	68
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	54
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The lowest data component was ELA Lowest 25 which was 41%. Seven points less than the state's average of 48%. Meadow Park has a high number of ESE students. We are also the center site for Emotional Behavior Disorder. The school average improved two points from 17/18. However, this component continues to be one of the lowest data components for the school. Although it is difficult to pin point one contributing factor, I believe students in this sub group need targeted reading remediation and additional reading instruction beyond the 90 minute reading block. Due to staffing issues, a full time substitute provided remedial reading to many of our L25 students in fifth grade. This is one factor that may have contributed to low performance.

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

We did not have a data component that showed a decline. Although our ELA L25 went from 41% from 38%, we still feel this is an area which needs to be continued area of focus for improvement. SWD also showed a decline for ELA Learning Gains and Learning Gains for L25. Due to staffing issues, a full time substitute provided remedial reading to many of our L25 students in fifth grade. This is one factor that may have contributed to low performance.

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.

The ELA Lowest 25 percent showed the greatest gap when compared to the state (School: 41% State 53%). Again, possible staffing issues may have contributed to the 41% and again Meadow Park is the center for the "EBD" students with disabilities.

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

The greatest improvement was Math Lowest 25 percent. A gain of 25 points from 17/18 to 18/19. We quickly identified these students. We then targeted remediation by a certified

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

An area of concern is SWD for ELA proficiency and gains. The index for SWD was 41% just meeting the Federal Index. This subgroup will continue to be an area of focus for improvement. The other potential area of concern is African American/Black for ELA proficiency and gains.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25 percent
2. ELA gains
3. Math Lowest 25 percent
4. Math proficiency & Gains
5. Early Intervention (First Grade)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	To increase ELA gains for students in the Lowest 25 percent in the fourth and fifth grades
Rationale	By reviewing FSA data over the past several years, ELA gains for the Lowest 25 percent continue to perform below the district and state average.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2019/20 school year, 55% of student in the Lowest 25 percent will demonstrate a learning gain in ELA based on the 2018/19 FSA ELA assessment test.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The Continuous Improvement Model will be used to instruct, evaluate, and monitor the intervention groups for the L25 students in reading. Students who qualify for this sub-group will be provided with a research based remedial reading program called SRA Corrective Reading. Students will be given an additional 45 minutes of reading instruction using SRA Corrective Reading. Based on SRA assessment results, L25 ELA students will be placed in a level. Every 4-6 weeks, these students will be administered the STAR reading assessment to determine and gauge student progress. For the 2018/19 school year, an evidence and researched based reading program called "Reading Recovery" will be implemented to address early intervention for targeted first graders. Additionally, SRA Early Intervention kits will be used to work with below level readers in K-2.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	SRA Corrective Reading, SRA Early Interventions, and Reading Recovery are effective researched based supplemental reading programs which target students who are one or more years below grade level. Based on several years of FSA data, the Lowest 25 percent students fail to make above average learning gains.
Action Step	
Description	1. Assess and identify the students in L25 who qualify for SRA Corrective Reading (4th & 5th) and Reading Recovery (1st) 2. Provide Professional Development in SRA Corrective Reading & SRA Early Interventions to ESE/Intervention teachers and ESE paraprofessionals who will be providing SRA Corrective Reading & SRA Early Intervention instruction 3. Provide year long training in Reading Recovery to two "Reading Recovery" teachers and utilize the Reading Recovery Program to target and instruct below level first graders 4. Conduct weekly classroom walk throughs through ESE "EBD" classrooms and "ESE/Intervention" classrooms to determine fidelity of SRA Corrective Reading 5. Provide Professional Development to all teachers in grades 2-5 in Top Score Writing Program. Teachers will incorporate Top Score Writing program into their ELA block in grades 3-5. Classroom walk throughs will be conducted to ensure writing program is being implemented in grades 2-5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2	
Title	To increase overall ELA proficiency for students in fourth and fifth grades.
Rationale	The overall reading proficiency rate for fourth graders for the 2018/19 school year was 44%. When reviewing ELA FSA data over the past several years, our proficiency rates for 4th and 5th grade have been below the District average. Furthermore, while desegregating 4th and 5th grade ELA FSA data, "Text Based Writing" scores were predominately average to below average.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2019/20 school year, ELA proficiency for fourth and fifth grade will increase by 10 points for 4th grade and 5 points for 5th grade as determined on the spring FSA ELA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	For the 2019/20 school year, TOP Score Writing program will be infused into the 90 minute reading block for students in grades 2-5. TOP Score Writing program is writing program specifically to enhance the writing skills for students in grades 2-5. The program also sharpens students' ability in the area of texted based writing. Next, teachers will implement Sadlier, "Progress Language Arts" which aligns ELA instruction to the FSA ELA assessment. Teachers will utilize this supplemental resource during the intervention block for Tier I students. Furthermore, MPE will implement Reading Recovery for first grade. Reading Recovery is a Tier III reading intervention program for first grade. Last, "Critical Concepts" for ELA will be implemented into the area of planning and instruction. Critical Concepts is researched based and comes from the "Critical Concepts Project-Marzano Resources."
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	When reviewing previous FSA ELA "Text Based" writing data, there is a skill deficit in writing for intermediate students. When researching effective writing programs and collaborating with several schools who have implemented the program with fidelity, there was a significant improvement in writing. -Reviewed FSA ELA "Text Based Writing" data -Reviewed monthly writing pieces during the 18/19 year showing a need for further instruction in writing -Reviewed Top Score Writing program and resources -Collaborated with other schools/districts who use the program to enhance writing -District's Division of Professional Learning has research Marzano's "Critical Concepts" and has made it a priority to embed the principals in daily instruction for ELA. -Reading Recovery is a researched based reading intervention program from Ohio State University and is used by several school districts across the country. The program has shown to have reduced retention rates in third grade and increase the number of students on grade level in reading in 4th and 5th grades.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide Top Score Writing professional development 2. Participate in District wide writing prompts 3. During monthly grade level meetings, review writing data in grades 2-5 4. Continue to train specific teachers in the area of "Critical Concepts" 5. Conduct classroom walk throughs to observe "Critical Concepts" and discuss during

monthly grade level meetings

6. Implement Sadlier Progress English Language Arts in grades 3-5 during the intervention block to better align ELA instruction with the Florida Standards.

7. Implement Reading Recovery at Meadow Park.

Person Responsible	Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3	
Title	To increase ELA proficiency and gains for SWD
Rationale	By reviewing ELA FSA data over the past several years, ELA proficiency and gains for the SWD continue to perform below average.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2019/20, SWD will increase ELA proficiency to 42% from 37%. 48% of SWD will demonstrate a learning gain in ELA based on the spring FSA ELA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The Continuous Improvement Model will be used to instruct, evaluate, and monitor the intervention groups for the SWD in reading. Students who qualify for this sub-group will be provided with a research based remedial reading program called SRA Corrective Reading and SRA Early Interventions. Students will be given an additional 45 minutes of reading instruction using SRA Corrective Reading and Early Interventions based on SRA assessment results, SWD ELA students will be placed in a level. Every 4-6 weeks, these students will be administered the STAR reading assessment to determine and gauge student progress. Additionally, SRA Early Intervention kits will be used to work with below level readers in K-2.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	SRA Corrective Reading and SRA Early Interventions are effective researched based supplemental reading programs which target students who are one or more years below grade level. Based on several years of FSA data, SWD fail to make average proficiency scores and gains on the FSA ELA assessment. SWD writing sores also fall below average.

Action Step	
Description	1. Assess and identify SWD students who qualify for SRA Corrective Reading and SRA Early Interventions (K-5th) 2. Provide Professional Development in SRA Corrective Reading & SRA Early Interventions to ESE/Intervention teachers and ESE paraprofessionals who will be providing SRA Corrective Reading & SRA Early Intervention instruction 3. Conduct weekly classroom walk throughs in ESE "EBD" classrooms and "ESE/Intervention" classrooms to determine fidelity of SRA Corrective Reading & SRA Early Interventions 4. Conduct monthly data meetings with ESE teachers and paraprofessionals to determine student progress 5. Self Contained (EBD) teachers will utilize Top Score Writing program to enhance text based writing skills for their students 6. Provide Top Score Writing professional development and conduct classroom walk throughs during writing instruction
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#4	
Title	To increase Math gains for students in the Lowest 25
Rationale	Based on 2018/19 FSA data, 52% of students in Lowest 25 percent made learning gains in math. Based on 2018/18 FSA data, 27% of students in Lowest 25 percent made learning gains in math.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2019/20 school year, 56% of students in the Lowest 25 percent will make a learning gain in math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students in the Lowest 25 percent will be provided with small group differentiated math instruction using FL Math Support Coach and FL Performance coach. There is also a school wide Ready Math plan in which all teachers will follow. Teachers will also collaborate on a monthly basis, review math common assessments, and provide math remediation during the intervention block.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	FL Math Support Coach and Fl Performance Coach our evidence based supplemental math materials used to meet the needs of struggling students in math in grades 3-5.
Action Step	
Description	1. Provide math remediation during intervention block to student in the L25 using FL Math Coach. 2. Common Assessments will be administered and analyzed for progress monitoring. 3. Data chats with grade level teachers and intervention teachers will occur on a monthly basis to determine progress towards goal. 4. Reflex math will be used in grades 2-5 to increase math fact fluency. 5. The Ready Math Toolbox will be used as a resource and guide to assist L25 students.
Person Responsible	Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

NA

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Meadow Park will conduct monthly SAC meetings and parent volunteer meetings to building positive relationships and rapport with families and the community. We will hold quarterly academic functions and other family and community events for or families and students. They will include Science Fair, STEM night, Math night, and Literacy week. We also have our family reading center open to students and families twice a week. Furthermore, Meadow Park will have a parent meeting once a month called "All Pro Families". The meetings will provide parents an opportunity to learn about how they can help their son or daughter at home with reading and academics.
The Leadership team will continue to build strong relationship with the community and other community organizations such as the Kiwanis, the Port Charlotte United Methodist Church, the Cup Scouts, the Girls on the Run, Yah Yah food backpack program, Port Charlotte Baptist Church, and others.

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The guidance counselor conducts monthly guidance lessons for all students grade K-5 at Meadow Park. Topics discussed during classroom visits include conflict resolution and fostering a positive school community. Through a grant, Meadow Park has implemented a social skills program called Sanford Harmony. Teachers are utilizing this program to build and foster positive classroom communities and to build healthy peer relationships and friendships. At Meadow Park, there is a school social worker, school psychologist, and guidance counselor that are available throughout the week to provide counseling, mentoring, and other pupil services. Charlotte County Public school also partners with several outside agencies that provide individual counseling to students and provides support for homeless families and students. As a Positive Behavior Support school and community we reinforce appropriate behaviors and attitudes and celebrate student success on a weekly, monthly, and quarterly basis.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Pre-K to KG:
~In May, students from PK classes at MPE and those from private PK facilities participate in a day of visitation to our KG classrooms. The time is spent introducing students to the set-up of a KG classroom, routines and procedures, and an overview of the expectations for the first days of school.
~Students enter KG with a delayed entry, with only half attending the first day and half the next. This allows students to receive more individualized attention to start the children's educational experience.
~In addition, KG has a parent orientation breakfast on the first day of school to answer questions and provide information about dismissal, communication, and involvement. This ensures a less-crowded environment that is less likely to overwhelm the students or the parents.

Elementary to Middle School:
~In May, students are invited to Murdock Middle School for an introduction to the middle school environment. Students are provided with transportation to the schools where they are given a

presentation by the administrative staff and a few teachers on basic policies and procedures, and the students are then allowed to ask questions. (TOPS students visit their actual geographic middle schools.)
~Students with an IEP will have an IEP meeting prior to transitioning to the middle school so that all supports needed for the student in the new school can be put into place.
~This year, fifth grade is departmentalizing their instruction, which helps students to become accustomed to the transitions they will experience in middle school.
~The majority of our staff members have participated in a "growth mindset" professional development training, and all staff members are encouraged to use growth mindset strategies and language with students. Research indicates that having a growth mindset helps student to transition more successfully between school levels.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Annually-
Title One Survey indicates percentages with success and/or need in Parent Involvement (parent-school relations, home-school communication, parent awareness of activities, school quality satisfaction, availability of information, and attendance at school meetings). Meeting in May is attended by Principal, AP, Lead Teacher, SAC chair, additional SAC board member, Parent Involvement Specialist, and a teacher representative (at a minimum). Best practices are shared at the meeting, highlighting those with the highest impact. A problem-solving conversation is begun, which includes barriers and plans for elimination of them. A plan for improving weak areas is created, a timeline with names and responsibilities is created, and a calendar of events is written. During this time, the funding sources are considered and written into the plan. The plan includes alignment of personnel, instruction, and curriculum.
Accountability Report indicates trends for our school, and includes data ranging from demographics to climate surveys, to specific student group performance on standardized testing. This report is then reviewed in-depth by our Core Team, Program Planners (in the summertime meeting), teachers (at first day back-to-school meeting) and the initial SAC meeting. T

Quarterly-
i-Ready Assessment reports and STAR assessments provide specific areas of strengths and weaknesses based upon the FL standards. These reports are measured against those of other schools as well. The reports are analyzed by the Core Team and then Program Planners at the meetings for each (led by principal/AP), and then at the upcoming PD meetings for each grade level (led by Lead Teacher). At the initial assessment review, an Action Plan is created for each grade level. The Action Plan includes resources needed, and funding sources for the resources. Adjustment to instructional strategies may be made based upon best practices vs current practices.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Our guidance counselor provides career and college awareness lessons to all of our 5th grade classes. Students are provided important information regarding college and careers.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To increase ELA gains for students in the Lowest 25 percent in the fourth and fifth grades				$114,519.33
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		100-Salaries	0141 - Meadow Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$114,519.33
			Notes: The Reading Recovery program is a research based reading intervention program used by several states and districts throughout the United States. The "Reading Recovery Program/Institute" is based out of Ohio State University. The program focuses on early reading intervention. The Reading Recovery position is evidence based and is mentioned as one of the most sucussfull reading intervention programs in the country. There is extensive research and data with Reading Recovery that demonstrates a significant reduction in retention rates and the narrowing of achievement gaps in reading			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To increase overall ELA proficiency for students in fourth and fifth grades.				$24,709.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		500-Materials and Supplies	0141 - Meadow Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$6,279.50
			Notes: Sadlier Progress Language Arts is a supplemental ELA program which aligns the FSA Standards to ELA instruction. Students in grades 3-5 will receive additional ELA Tier I instruction (Sadlier Progress Language Arts) during their intervention block.			
		529-Technology-Related Textbooks	0141 - Meadow Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$18,430.00
			Notes: Top Score Writing is a research based writing program utilized throughout the state of Florida. In order to increase ELA FSA scores, there needs to be a strong focus on writing school wide.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To increase ELA proficiency and gains for SWD				$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		310-Professional and Technical Services	0141 - Meadow Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$5,000.00
			Notes: Provided ESE teachers with Professional Development in SRA Corrective Reading and Early Interventions. This program will be used as a remediation program to assist improve ELA proficiency for ESE students in grades K-5.			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To increase Math gains for students in the Lowest 25				$0.00
					Total:	$144,228.83