Myakka River Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Myakka River Elementary School

12650 WILLMINGTON BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33981

http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/mre

Demographics

Principal: Grace Tollefson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2016

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)	99%
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: C (49%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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

Myakka River Elementary School

12650 WILLMINGTON BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33981

http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/mre

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	93%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	18%

School Grades History

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

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.

Myakka River Elementary is a caring family and community growing M.I.G.H.T.Y. leaders to achieve academic excellence. Our motto is "We Believe, We Lead, We Achieve".

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering students to become lifelong, well-rounded learners while providing a safe nurturing environment.

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
Tollefson, Grace	Principal	Grace Shepard serves as the school Principal. She oversees the entire staff in providing professional, educational leadership. This is completed through PLC's, PD's, Data Days, Staff and Faculty meetings, and/or Instructional Leader meetings. Within these meetings, collaborative shared decision making is practiced. She serves on the School Advisory Committee, as well as Co-chairing the Partnership and Performance Committee. She summarizes data to assist teachers and students with learning needs and is responsible for the development of the school's master schedule and school events calendar. Additionally, the Principal oversees the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. She shares the responsibility for all communication disseminated from the school, analyzes and articulates data and shares in the safety of all persons on campus.
Kelch, Kristina	Assistant Principal	Kristina Kelch serves as the school Assistant Principal. She assists the Principal with professional and educational needs of the staff, students, and families of Myakka River Elementary. She Co-chairs the Support Staff Partnership and Performance Committee and serves as Team Leader for the Positive Behavior System Committee. She serves as a TST Coach and assists with the Rti process for all grade levels. She is a member of the Parent Teacher Organization and shares the responsibility of all disciplinary instances. Furthermore, she provides leadership for the ELL program at our school. She will also co-chair our Literacy team and Math and Science team.
Dillmore, Carrie	Teacher, K-12	Carrie Dillmore serves as the school Lead Teacher. She supports teachers in the classroom and with the analysis of data and the reporting process. She provides professional development for our staff in the areas of curriculum and instruction, as well as Professional Learning opportunities. Additionally, she is a member of the ELL team and is an Instructional Coach for all teachers as needed.
Gibson, Marie	School Counselor	Marie Gibson serves as the school Guidance Counselor. She supports teachers in the classroom by providing lessons in social and developmental topics, such as, "Bullying". She provides support in the Child Talk process for grades Kindergarten through second. Also, she provides individual and small group counseling for students as needed. Our Guidance Counselor is also a

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		member of the ELL team and works closely with our community businesses to establish school partnerships and relations. Marie Gibson serves as a valuable resource for our 504 students and disseminates this information to parents and families through formal and informal meetings. She is also our MTSS champion.
Casale, Kathy	Other	ESE Liaison She supports teachers in the classroom by providing strategies and interventions for students. As well, she meets regularly with teachers to provide advice for students with exceptional needs. She is an integral part of our Rti meetings, Child Talk meetings, and PBIS team. She works closely with families, parents and care givers to provide valuable information.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	105	79	92	79	98	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	539
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	7	5	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	28	0	0	5	49	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	18	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	1	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	6	7	7	21	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
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)

28

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

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	0	10	20	16	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	12	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	5	1	2	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	0	10	20	16	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	12	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	5	1	2	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	63%	62%	57%	60%	60%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	57%	58%	63%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	50%	53%	56%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	63%	63%	70%	67%	61%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains	48%	54%	62%	67%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	42%	51%	50%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	54%	53%	59%	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	105 (0)	79 (0)	92 (0)	79 (0)	98 (0)	86 (0)	539 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	12 (10)	7 (20)	5 (16)	8 (14)	13 (18)	45 (78)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	1 (1)	1 (1)	5 (1)	0 (3)	2 (1)	10 (7)
Course failure in ELA or Math	28 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (6)	49 (1)	68 (0)	150 (7)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	18 (12)	30 (27)	53 (39)

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	78%	69%	9%	58%	20%
	2018	68%	63%	5%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%
	2018	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	53%	56%	-3%	56%	-3%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	70%	-5%	62%	3%
	2018	64%	69%	-5%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2019	58%	60%	-2%	64%	-6%
	2018	57%	61%	-4%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	52%	56%	-4%	60%	-8%
	2018	54%	62%	-8%	61%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	52%	4%	53%	3%
	2018	60%	63%	-3%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	42	30	19	35	33	29	29				
ELL	54			62							
HSP	66	60		50	57		40				
WHT	62	47	27	61	46	37	57				
FRL	60	42	17	52	38	23	57				
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	28	48	50	29	41	37	55				
ELL	45			64							
HSP	52	50		36	33	30					
WHT	59	52	40	63	53	41	62				
FRL	51	53	47	53	47	39	49				
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	9	42	44	30	42	42	22				
ELL	45			64							
HSP	69	74		53	68						
WHT	59	62	57	73	66	45	59				

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
FRL	51	62	59	65	65	42	48				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	341
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	58
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	
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	55
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	48
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	41
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.

ELA Lowest 25% scored 28% for the lowest performance component. Did not have a strong Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention program that was used consistently. We started using Florida Coach program in late November. We have also been in an ESE inclusion model for the last 2 years where support is

pushed into the classroom. This could have contributed to our low performance. We also feel that the grade level standards were not taught to the level of rigor that is necessary to allow our students to make a year's growth.

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

ELA Lowest 25% had the greatest decline from the prior year. Did not have a strong Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention program that was used consistently. We started using Florida Coach program in late November. We have also been in an ESE inclusion model for the last 2 years where support is pushed into the classroom. This could have contributed to our low performance. We also feel that the grade level standards were not taught to the level of rigor that is necessary to allow our students to make a year's growth.

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.

ELA Lowest 25% had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Did not have a strong Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention program that was used consistently. We started using Florida Coach program in late November. We have also been in an ESE inclusion model for the last 2 years where support is pushed into the classroom. This could have contributed to our low performance. We also feel that the grade level standards were not taught to the level of rigor that is necessary to allow our students to make a year's growth.

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

ELA Proficiency showed the most improvement going from 58% to 63%. We used the Comprehensive Literacy Framework.

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

One area of concern is the number of students who have been previously retained in our third grade. We currently have 21 students who are in our third grade that have been retained at some point between K - 3 grade.

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

1. ELA Learning Gains (48%) Goal 63%
2. ELA L25 (28%) Goal 60%
3. Math Learning Gains (48%) Goal 63%
4. Math L25 (39%) Goal 60%
5. Science (56%) Goal 63%
6. TS & I Students with Disabilities (31%) Goal 42%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	When we look at our three year data trend in ELA Learning gains, we have gone from 63% to 48%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal this year is to move our ELA learning gains from 48% to 63%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kristina Kelch (kristina.kelch@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will be meeting with all grade level teams for collaborative planning sessions weekly. Charlotte County Public schools added an additional 30 minutes to the instructional day this year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By meeting with teams weekly and reviewing data on a regular basis, we will be able to determine how our students are progressing through our ELA standards. We will also be able to ensure that the instructional strategies that were selected to deliver material is impacting student learning. The resources that will be utilized include our LAFS curriculum, Reading Street, STAR program, Charlotte County Public Schools pacing and curriculum guides, Florida State Standards and ladders, and planning forms. We will determine common assessments that will be used during our sessions.

Action Step	
Description	Collaborative Planning Session Action Steps
1. During these sessions we will analyze common assessments, review the curriculum pacing guides to determine the outcome.
2. We will determine the instructional strategies we will utilize for delivery of Tier 1 instruction.
3. We will discuss tools that can be used to deliver instructions.
4. We will create a plan and review the plan to check for rigor and relevance.
5. We will discuss the grouping of students based on level and skill need and make adjustments when necessary. This will allow us to provide instruction for all students utilizing our district selected materials.
We will also take our teams through planning sessions for our iii/enrichment students. Those students who are on grade level or in need of enrichment will be grouped accordingly so that they are able to make growth.

Additional Action Steps to improve ELA Gains
1. Tier 1: All Students will receive instruction with our school based instructional series, LAFS instruction, standards based instruction, Top Score Writing, and STAR
2. STAR progress monitoring will take place at least 5 times per year
3. All standards and learning goals will continue to be posted
4. DOK, lessons, or activities will match the complexity of the standard
5. Lead Teacher and/or Literacy Coach will model lessons in classrooms
6. Instruction will be differentiated based on student needs and guided reading (small group) will take place daily
7. Each teacher will be given curriculum guides/pacing guides/standard ladders that will be |

followed during the year and they are expected to bring these guides with them to collaborative planning meetings

8. On grade level and above grade level students will be provided with enrichment opportunities during WIN time and ELA instructional block

9. Encourage the continued use of our Accelerated Reading program grades K-5

10. Utilize the Scholastic Book Room for guided reading instruction

11. Teachers, students, and administration will monitor progress using STAR assessment, iReady Standards 12. Mastery assessments, and classroom assessments on a monthly basis. This information will be housed in student data notebooks.

13. UNRAAVEL Strategies

14. Teachers will participate in grade level meetings, professional development sessions, collaborative planning sessions

15. Every minute counts and all resources must be utilized, this includes ESE push-in support and para support

Person Responsible   Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#2	
Title	ELA L25 Learning Gains
Rationale	Looking at our three year trend, we have gone from 56% to 28% for L25 ELA learning gains.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to go from 28% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implemented a systematic instructional program for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Increased the instructional day for our Tier 3 students by inviting them to school 15 before the late bell and using 15 minutes of Physical Education time for a 30 minute block. Providing professional development on high effect size strategies for instructional delivery. Analyzing data from common assessments and frequent progress monitoring assessments through STAR. Charlotte County Public schools added an additional 30 to the instructional day this year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Tier 2 students will receive instruction using Florida Coach program in addition to the Tier 1 instructional resources. These students will be grouped and pulled for instruction to our Mighty Achiever room (intervention room) where they will be working in small groups with certified teachers and highly qualified para professionals. Our Tier 3 students will receive instruction using SRA corrective intervention and decoding program. These students will be invited to school 15 minutes earlier and use 15 minutes of physical education time daily for this program. This will be in addition to Tier 2 and Tier 1 instruction.

Action Step	
Description	1. Tier 2: In addition to Tier 1 instruction, these students will receive additional support in a small group setting during the ELA block and WIN time using materials from STAR and Florida Reading Coach 2. Tier 3: In addition to Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction, these students will receive additional support built into the day in the intervention classroom instructed by the ESE push-in teacher, para and an ELA teacher. They will be using the SRA program. 3. Teachers will monitor progress of all L25 students on a monthly basis using STAR assessments, Florida Reading Coach assessments, Running Records, iReady Standards Mastery, and SRA 4. Tier 3 students will be buddied with a member of the core team for frequent check-ins. This will be monitored with scheduling/reflection sheet 5. UNRAAVEL Strategies 6. Attend child talk meetings and MTSS meetings for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students 7. Complete necessary paperwork, interventions, strategies with fidelity while taking students through the MTSS process
Person Responsible	Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3	
Title	Math Learning Gains
Rationale	Our three year trend for math learning gains shows that we have gone from 67% to 48%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal for this year to to go from 48% to 63%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will be meeting with all grade level teams for collaborative planning sessions weekly. Charlotte County Public schools added an additional 30 to the instructional day this year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By meeting with teams weekly and reviewing data on a regular basis, we will be able to determine how our students are progressing through our math standards. We will also be able to ensure that the instructional strategies that were selected to deliver material is impacting student learning. The resources that will be utilized include our Ready Florida Math curriculum, Reflex math, iReady Math, STAR program, Charlotte County Public Schools pacing and curriculum guides, Florida State Standards and ladders, and planning forms. We will determine common assessments that will be used during our sessions.

Action Step	
Description	Collaborative Planning Action Steps 1. During these sessions we will analyze common assessments, review the curriculum pacing guides to determine the outcome. 2. We will determine the instructional strategies we will utilize for delivery of Tier 1 instruction. 3. We will discuss tools that can be used to deliver instructions. 4. We will create a plan and review the plan to check for rigor and relevance. 5. We will discuss the grouping of students based on level and skill need and make adjustments when necessary. This will allow us to provide instruction for all students utilizing our district selected materials. We will also take our teams through planning sessions for our iii/enrichment students. 6. Those students who are on grade level or in need of enrichment will be grouped accordingly so that they are able to make growth. Additional Action Steps for Math Focus 1. Tier 1: All Students will receive instruction with our school based instructional series Ready Math, standards based instruction, Reflex math, and iReady math instruction 2. Instruction will be differentiated based on student needs 3. All standards and learning goals will continue to be posted 4. DOK, lessons, or activity will match the complexity of the standard 5. Each teacher will be given curriculum guides/pacing guides/standard ladders that will be followed during the year and are expected to bring these to all collaborative planning meetings 6. On grade level and above grade level students will be provided with enrichment opportunities during the math block

7. Teachers, students, and administration will monitor progress using iReady math assessment, iReady

8. Standards Mastery assessments, and classroom assessments on a monthly basis. This information will be housed in student data notebooks.

9. Teachers will participate in grade level meetings, professional development sessions, collaborative planning sessions

10. UNRAAVEL Strategies

11. Every minute counts and all resources must be utilized; this includes ESE push in support and para support

Person Responsible   Kristina Kelch (kristina.kelch@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#4	
Title	Math L25 Learning Gains
Rationale	Looking at our 3 year trend, we have gone from 50% to 39% in math L25 learning gains.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to go from 39% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implemented a systematic instructional program for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Providing professional development on high effect size strategies for instructional delivery. Analyzing data from common assessments and frequent progress monitoring assessments through STAR. Charlotte County Public schools added an additional 30 to the instructional day this year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will receive instruction using Florida Coach math program in addition to the Tier 1 instructional resources. These students will be grouped and pulled for instruction to our Mighty Achiever room (intervention room) where they will be working in small groups with certified teachers and highly qualified para professionals. We will utilize the additional 30 minutes that were added to the instructional day to provide iii/enrichment for math to all our students.

Action Step	
Description	1. All Teacher Expectations from Math Learning Gains will be implemented 2. Tier 2: In addition to Tier 1 instruction, these students will receive additional support in a small group setting during the Math block using materials from iReady Math, Florida Coach. 3. Tier 3: In addition to Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction, these students will receive additional support from during math block instructed by the ESE push-in teacher and a math teacher. They will also have an opportunity to attend our Mighty Math Achievers Club that takes place after school, Monday - Thursday. They will be using the Florida Coach Math program. 4. Teachers will monitor progress of all L25 students on a monthly basis 5. Tier 3 students will be buddied with a member of the core team for frequent check-ins 6. Attend child talk meetings and MTSS meetings for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students 7. UNRAAVEL Strategies 8. Complete necessary paperwork, interventions, strategies with fidelity while taking students through the MTSS process
Person Responsible	Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#5	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	Looking at our 3 year trend we have gone from 59% to 56% in science.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal this year is to go from 56% to 63%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We created a school-wide science initiative for all grade levels to follow. We will analyze science data to check progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The district goal was to increase science achievement. We will utilize the school wide science plan and the following resources: Science journals, Pearson Elevate, USA Testprep, CCPS pacing and curriculum guides, Florida Coach Science program, STEM incorporation, Collaborative planning efforts from all teachers.

Action Step	
Description	1. Follow the Pearson Elevate Pacing Guide found in your packet and in your TE. 2. Use Science notebooks daily and participate in the Morning News Science Picture of the Day prompts. 3. Begin science instruction Aug. 13 and continue to reinforce classroom rules, routines, and procedures. 4. Purposefully plan to engage in learning of your grade level content benchmarks during the your Science Block each morning 5. Students in grades K-5 should bring their Science consumable book with them to STEM lab. Students will complete the "uInvestigate Labs" or "uEngineer It" STEM activity. 6. It is encouraged to give students a chance to try "Quest Path" for each unit of study. 7. Display "Inquiry Vocabulary" words in your classroom. 8. Incorporate non-fictional science text from the media center, Science leveled readers & K-2 Reading AtoZ books into your Science/ELA block. 9. Administer student assessments: 1. K-2 EOY Pearson Assessment given at BOY & EOY 2. 3-4 BOY & EOY USA Testprep 3. 5th BOY & MOY USA Testprep& FCAT Science 4. Lesson quizzes can be collaborative or individual 5. Administer the "Assessment" pages at the end of each topic or unit. 6. Unit Tests
Person Responsible	Carrie Dillmore (carrie.dillmore@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#6	
Title	Students with Disabilities Targeted Support and Improvement
Rationale	Our sub category of students with disabilities scored at 31%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to move from 31% to 42%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kathy Casale (kathlyn.casale@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Inclusion model services for all students with disabilities. Students in classrooms will get ESE push in support. One conversion model classroom in 4th grade that is taught by an ESE certified teacher. This teacher will also loop up to 5th grade with these students. We have been given an additional VE ESE allocation and we have added a full time ESE Liaison position.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our goal is to provide the most inclusive environment for our students with disabilities to be successful.
Action Step	
Description	1. Maximize push-in support 2. Utilize support from the ESE liaison 3. Understand student IEPs and appropriate accommodations listed 4. Apply accommodations during all testing situations throughout the school year 5. Instruct grade level standards based content for all ESE students 6. ESE push-in teachers and classroom teachers will meet monthly to discuss student progress during collaborative Jam sessions 7. Lead Teacher and/or Literacy Coach will provide model lessons in inclusion classrooms
Person Responsible	Kathy Casale (kathlyn.casale@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).

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.

The school will involve the parents and families in an organized, ongoing, and timely manner, in the planning, review and improvement of Title I programs, including involvement in decision making of how funds for Title I will be used.
MRES has formed a Parent Engagement Planning Team which includes two parents, one community member, two teachers, Lead Teacher, Assistant Principal and Title I Paraprofessional.
On April 11th, 2019 members of the team attended a district Title I training covering the following topics: six types of involvement and their benefits, review and evaluate the 2018-2019 PFEP, use data to develop strategies while working with district PFET. The team used the Panorama Parent Engagement Survey results to identify areas for improvement and created goals to address them. The PFET will garner support from stakeholders to implement strategies. In the fall, the SAC will review the PFEP and offer suggestions and support. Our SAC will then approve the plan.
SAC has the opportunity to have input into our SIP plan. SAC will also approve the SIP. Within the SIP it itemizes how we will spend our Title 1 funds. We will plan events that will increase family involvement in our plan.
We will meet quarterly with parents, faculty, staff and administration to allow for implementation and modifications of the Title I Action Plan for Partnerships.

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.

Academic and Behavioral warning systems help to identify students in need of interventions through a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS). Early and timely interventions may only occur when a system that alerts us of the concerns, is in place. Currently, the district has three systems that provide information to help make timely adjustments necessary for student success. MTSS meetings are scheduled per the needs of individual students.

Our school's SAC (Co-Chaired by Principal and SAC Chair) meets one Tuesday of every other month throughout the school year, with a portion of each meeting to discuss the SIP.

The Partnership Performance Council (PPC) (Co-Chaired by Principal and PPC Chair) is a collaborative decision making team comprised of a representative from K-2, 3-5, Specials Area, ESE and Administration. They meet monthly with discussion on the School Improvement Plan (SIP).

Our Literacy Council (Chaired by our Media Specialist) meets on a monthly basis to discuss Florida Plan Standards implementation and process, and ways to encourage, support, and promote literacy throughout the school and home communities.

The Leadership Team meets with the Instructional Leaders of each grade level on a monthly basis or as needed. The Instructional Leaders meet with their teams on a weekly basis.

Our Threat Assessment Team meets monthly to discuss students who may need mental health support.

FOCUS data storage, i-Ready, EDIS, and the School Portal System programs provide a variety of district reports regarding retention, referrals, ESE and ELL status, and attendance data. FOCUS automatically generates five day, ten day, and 15 day attendance letters to communicate concern to the parents and/or guardians. The Social Worker reviews these letters, as well as the Assistant Principal prior to mailing. The Information Communication System (ICS) is also available to support school-based criteria for a custom report.

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

Students are welcomed to Myakka River Elementary through our Registrar, Guidance Counselor, Lead Teacher, Principal, and/or Assistant Principal. Background data is collected on each student from their previous school. Phone calls are placed to the previous school to obtain information on the student so appropriate/best placement may be made for the child. Additionally, FOCUS is utilized to research historical testing data and other pertinent information.

When we know a child is exiting our school, every attempt is made to wish the student well and provide support to the family in their future endeavors.

Our fifth graders visit their Middle School near the end of each school year. This program is entitled, "Step Up".
Additionally, the Guidance Department visits our school on a separate day for a time of Question and Answer. Parents are also invited to attend an end of the year Open House and PTO meeting.

Our "Kindergarten Roundup" is held every Spring for incoming Kindergartners. A campus tour and Kindergarten Classroom tour is provided for parents and their incoming Kindergartner. A Breakfast is provided for parents as well. Day Cares are also invited to participate in this event. At the onset of each school year, parents of Kindergartners are once again invited to attend an Open House especially arranged for them.

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.

Our Guidance Counselor provides small group instruction with students to inform them of their future endeavors. As well, we include high school students in various Literacy and Science activities to expose them to older students and advanced curriculum. A question and answer time is always available for our younger students to ask questions of the high school students regarding higher education.

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

We have created a rota-kids club for students in grade 3-5 that work very closely with our local community rotary. We take pride in the many partnerships with businesses and community organizations. We also have a variety of volunteers who work with our school family.