

Charlotte County Public Schools

Myakka River Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

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: 7/16/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* 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%)
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 was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	89%
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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

School Mission: Myakka River Elementary is a caring family and community growing M.I.G.H.T.Y. leaders to achieve academic excellence.

School Motto: Believe, Lead, and Achieve

Expectations: Motivated, Inspired, Grateful, Helpful, Thoughtful, You Make a Difference (MIGHTY)

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
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 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.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Magill, Ryane	Assistant Principal	Ryane Magill 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 Intervention and Support Committee. She serves as a TST Coach and assists with the MTSS 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/16/2016, Grace Tollefson

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners*

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	86	61	66	64	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
Attendance below 90 percent	8	13	13	7	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	6	5	2	5	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/11/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	

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%
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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	78%	69%	9%	58%	20%
	2018	68%	63%	5%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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						
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				
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%	1
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%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

ELA Lowest 25% scored 28% for the lowest performance component. During the 18/19 school year we 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?

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practice related to differentiation is an area of focus because it will increase learning for gains for all ELA and Math. In our three year data trend we have gone from 63% to 48% of our students making learning gains for ELA and we went from 67% to 48% in Math. Our data in this category shows that our instruction is reaching the average learner, however our highest and lowest quartile of students are not making learning gains consistently.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to move our learning gains in ELA from 48% to 63% on the ELA FSA. Our goal is to move our learning gains in Math from 48% to 60% on the Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ryane Magill (ryane.magill@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use leadership notebooks to set individual student expectations and provide formative evaluation to monitor student progress toward those goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of setting expectations with students is supported by John Hattie's Highly Effective strategies described in the book Visible Learning because the change in achievement related to that intervention is a 1.44 yield. The use of formative evaluation with students is supported by John Hattie's Highly Effective strategies described in the book Visible Learning because the change in achievement related to that intervention is a .9 yield.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher's will meet with all students by ability level

1. Set up leadership notebooks (goals are based on critical concepts and EYE data entered into EDIS)
2. Review BOY data with student and set goals (use STAR data or fluency or DRA or ready math unit assessments)
3. Group students by instructional needs for remediation or enrichment (skills or strategies)
4. Provide practice in skill based groups (SIPS, LAFS, DO the MATH, Freckle, Level Literacy, scholastic books, WTW, top score writing, lesson quizzes, Ready Math)
5. Assess formatively and provide feedback toward goal
6. Teachers will continue to progress monitor and adjust groups based on STAR, critical concepts and common assessment data.
7. Teachers will attend collaborative planning meetings twice a month where they will analyze common assessments, review curriculum pacing guides, determine instructional strategies and tools that will be used for delivery of instruction.

Person Responsible Ryane Magill (ryane.magill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teachers will set expectations by posting standards, learning goals, concepts, and making sure students can identify what is critical about those goals.

Teachers will ask questions at the DOK level expected of the standard (questions are available in LAFS/ Ready Math and scholastic materials).

Teachers will share their expectations for assessing student mastery during collaborative planning to make sure expectations are consistent and rigorous.

Person Responsible Ryane Magill (ryane.magill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practice related to small group instruction is an area of focus because it will increase learning gains for our L25 in ELA and Math. Our data in this category shows that our instruction was not meeting the needs of these learners because it dropped from 45% to 28% in ELA and Math stayed at 39%.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to move our learning gains for the L25 ELA from 28% to 60% on the ELA FSA. Our goal is to move our learning gains for the L25 Math from 39% to 60% on the Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will provide students in the L25 with Rtl (MTSS Multi Tiered Systems of Support) during WIN using systematic, multisensory and explicit instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Tier 2 students will receive instruction using Freckle, Do the Math, Leveled Literacy, or SIPS in addition to the Tier 1 instructional resources. These students will be grouped for instruction where they will be working in small groups with certified teachers and highly qualified para professionals.</p> <p>Our Tier 3 students will receive instruction using SIPS and Leveled Literacy corrective intervention and decoding program for ELA. These students will be invited to school 15 minutes earlier and use 15 minutes of physical education time daily for this program. Students will have Freckle or Do the Math lessons based on their needs from their most recent STAR assessment for Math. This will be in addition to Tier 2 and Tier 1 instruction.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

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, instructed by the ESE push-in teacher, para and an ELA teacher using the SIP, leveled literacy or SIPs program.
3. 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 Ready Math and Do the Math or Freckle.
4. Tier 3: In addition to Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction, these students will receive additional support during math block instructed by the ESE push-in teacher and/or classroom math teacher using ESSA recommended materials.

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

Teachers will analyze most recent data from formative and summative assessments to determine Tier 2 and Tier 3 instructional needs.

Tier 3 students will be partnered with a member of the core team for frequent check-ins and will be monitored with reflection sheet.

Attend child talk meetings and MTSS meetings for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. As well as complete necessary paperwork, interventions, strategies with fidelity while taking students through the MTSS process.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to the three year trend, we went from 59% to 56% in Science achievement.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal this year is to go from 56% to 63%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carrie Dillmore (carrie.dillmore@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers in grades K through 5 will use science inquiry vocabulary in direct, clear, repetitive, instruction presenign meanign and contextual example with multiple exposures.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The district goal was to increase science achievement. Instructional practice specifically relating to Science vocabulary according to visible learning for literacy has a high effect size strategy of .67.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Follow the Pearson Elevate Pacing Guide for K-4. 5th grade will follow Science Critical Concepts.
2. Use Science notebooks daily
3. Display the inquiry vocabulary words in the classroom.
4. Incorporate non-fiction science text from the media center, Science leveled readers & K-2 Reading A to Z books into your Science/ELA block.
5. Follow the district assessment calendar for Science assessments.

Specific to vocabulary:

Connection—new to the known, building that “semantic network” in the mind/brain

Use—academic speaking and writing as we construct and apply knowledge (not simply memorize or match, multiple choice,!etc

Person Responsible Carrie Dillmore (carrie.dillmore@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Our sub category of students with disabilities scored at 31%.

Measurable Outcome: 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 will be provided for all students with disabilities. Students will receive targeted ESE push in support with a clear focus for each lesson. The teacher will teach explicitly and tell them what they need to know and show them how to do it.

Our goal is to provide the most inclusive environment for our students with disabilities to be successful.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Florida statute 1003.57(1)(a)(2) The school district shall use the term inclusion shall mean a student is receiving education in a general education regular class setting. Robert Marzano claims it is important to explicitly teach your students the things they need to learn. John Hattie states the importance of explicitly teaching a carefully sequenced curriculum, with built in cumulative practice and using worked examples.

Action Steps to Implement

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 explicitly "tell and show"
6. ESE push-in teachers and classroom teachers will meet monthly to discuss student progress and plan explicit instruction
7. Lead Teacher will provide model lessons in inclusion classrooms using explicit teaching

Person Responsible Kathy Casale (kathlyn.casale@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Myakka River Elementary will improve student achievement through standards based instruction, collaboration, and high effect size strategies and we will increase the percent of students making their learning gain using research based interventions with fidelity.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

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 August, 17th 2020 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 2019-2020 PFEP, use data to develop strategies while working with district PFEP. The team used the Panorama Parent Engagement Survey results to identify areas for improvement and created goals to address them. The PFEP 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.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$27,291.08
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0231 - Myakka River Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$20,425.00
			Notes: Renaissance Programs: STAR 360, Freckle ELA, Math, and Science			
	5100	510-Supplies	0231 - Myakka River Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,000.00
			Notes: LAFS Workbooks (School Portion)			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0231 - Myakka River Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,403.28

			<i>Notes: Gifted PLC for teachers who have gifted students included in their classrooms to differentiate instruction in the classroom.</i>			
	6400	750-Other Personal Services	0231 - Myakka River Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,861.00
			<i>Notes: Payment for substitutes to cover teachers to attend teacher support team meetings</i>			
	5100	391-Subagreements up to \$25,000	0231 - Myakka River Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,601.80
			<i>Notes: Printing cost for grade level common assessments to monitor progress.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				\$7,621.86
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0231 - Myakka River Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,199.40
			<i>Notes: Raz Kidz Teacher Subscription for K-1 classes</i>			
	5100	391-Subagreements up to \$25,000	0231 - Myakka River Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$926.80
			<i>Notes: Printing cost for 5 a day math and DRA assessment kits to help group students by reading level</i>			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0231 - Myakka River Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,403.28
			<i>Notes: Math PLC stipend outside of contract day</i>			
	6400	160-Other Support Personnel	0231 - Myakka River Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,169.40
			<i>Notes: Math PLC stipend for paras outside of contract day</i>			
	6400	160-Other Support Personnel	0231 - Myakka River Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,403.28
			<i>Notes: Pay for paras to attend the school CHAMPS training during one of their non-contract days.</i>			
	6400	510-Supplies	0231 - Myakka River Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,519.70
			<i>Notes: Guided Reading and Choral Counting PD Books</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0231 - Myakka River Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: STEM Fuse Curriculum</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$3,007.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	0231 - Myakka River Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,007.00
			<i>Notes: Collaborative Planning Days for ESE and Inclusion Teachers</i>			
Total:						\$41,172.46