

Charlotte County Public Schools

Meadow Park 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

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: 8/1/2017

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)	100%
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: B (55%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	94%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	C

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.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Loge, Matt	Principal	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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 is 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	<p>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.</p>
Elek, Lauren	Assistant Principal	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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 is embedded into the culture of the school -Develop and create a school community which fosters and encourages student and faculty growth
Taylor, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Smith-Jaekel, Jessica	Instructional Coach	<p>Lead Teacher- provide coaching in the best practices of teaching and instruction. Models lessons for teachers and provides guidance and leadership in the area of collaborative planning. Provide PD in the area of guided reading, critical concepts, ELA, and Math.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/1/2017, Lauren Elek

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

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)	100%
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: B (55%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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 .	

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	80	79	80	107	83	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	511
Attendance below 90 percent	18	20	17	20	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	15	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	5	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	5	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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

Monday 9/28/2020

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	120	110	134	122	103	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	707
Attendance below 90 percent	12	6	12	10	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	3	5	5	1	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	26	32	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	22	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	1	1	12	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	3	6	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	120	110	134	122	103	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	707
Attendance below 90 percent	12	6	12	10	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	3	5	5	1	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	26	32	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	22	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	1	1	12	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	3	6	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	
	(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	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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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				
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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
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%	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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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%	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	54
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	49
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.

The lowest data component was ELA Lowest 25 which was 41%. Seven points less than the state's average of 48%. Meadow Park has the 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 areas for the school. Although it is difficult to pin point once contributing factor, we 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. However, during our last progress monitoring window of 19/20 (iReady Diagnostic), our L25 students in 4th and 5th grades did not make the gains we had hoped for. Although our ELA L25 went from 41% from 38% (18/19), we still feel this is an area of concern and a focus for improvement. SWD subgroup also showed 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 in the this area.

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 been a contributing factor and Meadow Park is the center for "EBD" (ESE) students.

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 and provided targeted remediation by a highly effective math teacher beyond the 60 minute math block.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

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

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

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

The importance of collaborative planning, professional learning communities, and the use of Marzano's "critical concepts" are essential for Tier I planning and instruction. The ability to effectively plan and pace as grade level teams are a vital process to ensure standards based instruction is occurring and that grade level teams are using Marzano's critical concepts to effectively plan and pace for Tier I instruction. Another instructional focus area will be providing common assessments and using the continuous improvement model to reteach, assess, and evaluate student progress. In addition to collaborative planning and the use of "critical concepts", writing instruction will be another targeted area for improvement in order to increase ELA achievement for 3rd, 4th and 5th grades.

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 generally average to below average. Last, when reviewing MOY ELA iReady data for the 19/20 school year, our proficiency scores for ELA were significantly below the district average.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the 2020/21 school year, ELA and Math proficiency for third, fourth and fifth grades will increase by 4 points as determined by the spring 2021 FSA ELA assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

School based collaborative teams and professional learning communities will be established. With the assistance of the "Lead Teacher", grade level teams will utilize Marzano's Critical Concepts and CCPS pacing and curriculum guides to ensure effective Tier I instruction is occurring in grades K-5. Grade level teams will work with the "lead teacher" to ensure grade levels are planning for effective Tier I instruction and creating common lesson plans that include the appropriate curricular standards and common assessments. Grade level teams will work together to ensure all grade level standards are taught and that the iii period will be used to provide remediation for students who are unable to master certain ELA and Math standards and concepts. Furthermore, the TOP Score Writing program will be infused into the 90 minute reading block to enhance the writing skills for students in grades 2-5.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Grade level teams have rarely used Marzano's Critical Concepts for planning and instruction and have minimally collaborated with one another to plan as grade level teams to ensure each grade level team is paci

When reviewing 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 and thus an improvement in ELA scores for 4th and 5th grade students.

Action Steps to Implement

- Implement Critical Concepts and Grade Level Collaborative Planning Teams to ensure grade level teams are planning using Critical Concepts and comparing common assessment data with one another.
- Work with L25/ESE teachers to ensure students who are not grasping grade level content in ELA/Math based on common assessment data are being retaught the standards during iii time.

- Infuse grade level common assessments as noted in Critical Concepts and CCPS pacing and curriculum guides
- Develop grade level lesson plans using Marzano's Critical Concepts. (Review lesson plans on MPE shared drive).
- Lead teacher will lead grade level collaborative planning twice a month.
- Review writing data 2-5
- Discuss TopScore pacing during collaborative planning and ensure grades levels are pacing and planning with one another.
- Utilize Ready Math for core math instruction for grades 3-5.
- Grade 3-5 teachers will infuse "Math for Today" as morning work and to practice previously taught math skills.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>The area of focus is to enhance the growth and proficiency of reading for students who fall into the lowest 25 percentile according to 18/19 FSA scores and progress monitoring data for the 19/20 school year. This sub group has fallen short of the district and state percentile rankings throughout the past several years. This area is a critical area of focus as we service many students who fall into multiple ESSA categories. Intensive remediation and differentiation is essential to ensure our students continue to grow and flourish in the area of reading.</p> <p>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 or Fountas and Pinnell LLI. Students will be given an additional 45 minutes of reading instruction using SRA Corrective Reading or LLI. Based on SRA assessment, STAR reading, and FSA (18/19) 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. In addition, we will continue to implement a first grade reading intervention program called "Reading Recovery". Last, we will infuse Literacy Lessons, a branch of Reading Recovery, for remediation for ESE students.</p> <p>Throughout the 20/21 school year, teachers will be provided with professional development in the area of "guided reading" by our reading recovery specialist. Teachers will learn how to better differentiate their reading instruction by become more effective in the area of guided reading.</p>
Measurable Outcome: Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>By the end of the 2020/21 school year, 55% of students in the Lowest 25 percent will demonstrate a learning gain in ELA based on the 2020/21 FSA ELA assessment exam and the end of the year STAR ELA school based assessment test.</p> <p>Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>SRA (Corrective Reading) and Fountas & Pinnell (LLI) are considered "strong" supplemental reading programs according to the research site, "Evidence for ESSA".</p> <p>The Continuous Improvement Model will be used to instruct, evaluate, and monitor the intervention groups for the L25 students in math. Students who qualify for this sub-group will be provided with a research based remedial reading programs called SRA, Corrective Reading and LLI (Fountas and Pinnell). Based on the STAR and SRA reading assessment results, L25 ELA students will be placed in the appropriate remedial ELA group. These students will receive daily remediation in reading for 45 minutes. Every 4-6 weeks, these students will be administered the STAR reading assessment to determine and gauge student progress. Furthermore, Meadow Park will continue to implement a remedial reading program called, "Reading Recovery" for identified first graders deficient in reading. This research based remedial reading program for first graders, will decrease student retention and lower the number of students identified as being "L25" in reading in fourth and fifth grades.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-	<p>Many of our students who fall into the L25 include ESE, 504, and ESOL students. These research proven intervention programs provide explicit, systematic instruction in the area of phonics, fluency, and comprehension.</p>

based

Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assess and identify the students in L25 who qualify for SRA Corrective Reading (4th & 5th), LLI, and Reading Recovery (1st)
2. Provide Professional Development in the area of "guided reading" by trained reading recovery teachers.
3. Provide year long training in Reading Recovery to one "Reading Recovery" teacher 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.
6. Provide year long Reading Recovery training for two Reading Recovery teachers and utilize the Reading Recovery program to target and provide remediation for identified first graders in reading.
6. Provide professional development to teachers 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 Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: An area of concern at Meadow Park, is the achievement levels of our Lowest 25% in Math. Based on 2018/19 FSA data, 52% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. Based on 2017/18 FSA data, 27% of students in Lowest 25% made a learning gain in math.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2020/21 school year, 55% of students in the Lowest 25% will demonstrate a learning gain in Math based on the 2020/21 FSA Math 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 math. Students who qualify for math remediation will be provided with small group differentiated math instruction using Reading Math, FL Math Coach and additional resources to provide remediation and math differentiation. Intervention math teachers will work with grade level teams to provide remediation and differentiation for students who demonstrate below average on grade level math common assessments (Clearsight) and STAR Math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Ready Math and FI Math Support Coach are evidence based core and supplemental math materials/programs that are used to meet the needs of struggling students in math.

Action Steps to Implement

1. During collaborative planning, discuss which students are performing below average on math common assessments and STAR math to determine who qualifies for additional math support.
2. Provide 45 minutes of additional math instruction and remediation for students in the L25 for math.
3. Utilize STAR Math to progress for students in this this sub group every 4-6 weeks.
4. Utilize Reflex Math or Freckle math fact fluency to ensure these students are increasing their math fact fluency.
5. The Ready Math toolbox will be used as a resource for all teachers to assist the L25 students in math.

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

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Meadow Park has a high number of ESE students which include student in the intellectual disability and emotional disability units. Furthermore, several of our ESE students who are mainstreamed into general education classrooms count towards more than one indicator. (ESE, L.25 ELA/Math, Gain ELA/Math). It is vital that our students in self-contained classes and those who are mainstreamed be provided with the same remedial reading and math programs that our L25 students are provided. Our ESE model allows our ESE teachers the ability to provide remedial reading and math services to both ESE students and general education students (L25). Considering this sub-group accounts for a large number of students in the lowest 25 in reading and math, it is essential that we target and provide intensive instruction in reading and math. These students receive an additional 45 minutes of ELA and Math instruction daily.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the 2020/21 school year, SWD students will increase ELA proficiency to 42% from 37%. 48% of SWD students will demonstrate a learning gain in ELA based on the spring FSA ELA assessment exam.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Students in self-contained EBD classes and ESE students in general education classes will receive additional instruction and support in the area of ELA. ESE/L25 teachers will utilize SRA Corrective Reading, SRA Early Interventions, Fountas and Pinnell LLI, SIPS, and Florida Coach to provide intensive remediation 45 minutes a day. SRA and Fountas and Pinnell are researched based and are highly rated by the FLDOE.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

SRA Corrective Reading, Fountas and Pinnell LLI, and SIPS are researched based remediation programs and are highly rated according to the FLDOE. The resources being used are provided on each students' level and have built in assessments to gauge each student's progress. We will also utilize STAR Reading to provide progress monitoring for all of our SWD students.

Action Steps to Implement

- Identify students with IEPs in grades K-5 who require ESE minutes in ELA.
- Provide SRA assessments during the first few weeks of school in grades K-5 to determine students' level of instruction in SRA.
- Develop a ELA ESE service model in grades K-5 to ensure SWD students receive an additional 45 minutes of remediation and instruction using SRA, LLI, and SIPS.
- STAR Reading will be used every 4-6 weeks to monitor the progress of our SWD students.
- ESE/L25 teachers will be a part of their grade level collaborative team meetings. They will also provide remediation and reteach grade level ELA/Math standards as determined by common assessment data (Clearsight).
- Administration will meet ESE/L25 teachers every 4-6 weeks to tweak and adjust class lists.

Person Responsible

Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will utilize a structured daily intervention schedule and plan to provide reading and math interventions and instruction for our students in the Lowest 25%. We will provide additional remediation and intervention above and beyond the 90 min reading block and 60 minute math block for those students using Corrective Reading, Fountas and Pinnell LLI resources, FL Math Coach, and Ready Math. . A certified teacher will provide the intensive small group remediation utilizes these resources. Furthermore, our ESE self-contained classes will also provided Corrective Reading and Fountas and Pinnell LLI during the intervention block. These two initiatives will address the area of focus for our L25 students and ESE students. Last, we will utilize our Reading Recovery teachers to provide small group intensive remediation for students who exited our Reading Recovery program in first grade last year.

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.

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 relationships with the community organizations such as the Kiwanis, the Port Charlotte United Methodist, Community Life Church, Murdock Baptist Church, the Cup Scouts, the Girls on the Run. We continue to focus on building relationships and fostering school and community 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: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$2,880.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3240	230013-PRINT SHOP CHARGES	0141 - Meadow Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$450.00
			Notes: Printing of Critical Concepts and Rubrics			
	3240	239-Other	0141 - Meadow Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,430.00
			Notes: Top Score Professional Development			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$4,795.46
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3240	510-Supplies	0141 - Meadow Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$4,795.46
			Notes: Student supplies for SRA Corrective Reading and Early Interventions in Reading programs.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$3,024.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3240	510-Supplies	0141 - Meadow Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,024.00
			Notes: Florida Support Coach for Math L25			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
Total:						\$10,699.46