

Charlotte County Public Schools

East Elementary School



2021-22 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	0

East Elementary School

27050 FAIRWAY DR, Punta Gorda, FL 33982

<http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/ees>

Demographics

Principal: Melissa White

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

East Elementary School

27050 FAIRWAY DR, Punta Gorda, FL 33982

<http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/ees>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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	21%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	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.

The mission of East Elementary is to create a leadership environment that allows and inspires success for everyone.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Student Success!

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
White, Melissa	Principal	Instructional Personnel Evaluations School Advisory Council Instructional Staff Concerns Parent Teacher Org. (PTO) Parent Concerns re: staff related Student placement PPC co-chair Scheduling Budgeting
Blondun, Kim	Assistant Principal	SSPPC Co-Chair Support Staff evaluations Safety/Discipline Concerns Volunteers & Volunteer Breakfast Parent Involvement Plan Chair Buses and Bus Driver Breakfast Safety Issues Crisis Plan Raptor FSA Testing Coordinator PBIS Chair Student Discipline MTSS Case Manager for Behavior interventions
Wideikis, Karisa	School Counselor	Hospital Homebound Contact Person MTSS Case Manager Grades K Home Schooling Contact Person ELL Sreening/CELLA testing IQ Achievement Screenings Bully Prevention Coordinator Classroom Guidance Lessons Group/Individual Counseling MTSS Coordinator 504 Coordinator
Cleary, Cassandra	Instructional Coach	Professional Development Committee Chair Progress Monitoring Testing Coordinator Professional Development Coordinator MTSS Case Manager - Grades 1/2 Kindergarten Round Up Co Chair Scholastic Guided Reading Room SAT10 NET Mentor C & I Liaison Instructional Coach
Lynch, Lori	Instructional Coach	Reading Recovery Teacher (21.22 training year) MTSS Case Manager Grade 1

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Instructional Coach NET Mentor DRA Testing Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Melissa White

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.*

5

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

658

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	133	91	117	118	106	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	658
Attendance below 90 percent	4	22	21	32	23	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	13	9	12	12	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	1	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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

Thursday 8/5/2021

2020-21 - 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	80	81	86	87	74	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	496
Attendance below 90 percent	1	4	14	6	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	80	81	86	87	74	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	496	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	4	14	6	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	

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	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				69%	62%	57%	62%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	57%	58%	55%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	50%	53%	44%	41%	48%
Math Achievement				70%	63%	63%	72%	65%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	54%	62%	66%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	42%	51%	46%	39%	47%
Science Achievement				68%	54%	53%	61%	66%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	79%	69%	10%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	57%	-1%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2021					
	2019	66%	56%	10%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	81%	70%	11%	62%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	60%	-5%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	56%	13%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	68%	52%	16%	53%	15%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Adaptive Progress Monitoring, STAR 360, USA Test Prep, Benchmark Interim Assessments

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40/43%	51/51%	76/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/34%	21/39%	36/60%
	Students With Disabilities	2/17%	3/25%	6/46%
	English Language Learners	0	1/50%	1/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41/44%	64/65%	64/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/28%	29/54%	32/53%
	Students With Disabilities	3/25%	7/58%	6/46%
	English Language Learners	0	2/100%	2/100%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47/50%	68/69%	76/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/43%	40/62%	46/64%
	Students With Disabilities	3/21%	5/36%	7/41%
	English Language Learners	1/33%	1/25%	1/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36/37%	64/65%	83/76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/43%	40/62%	49/68%
	Students With Disabilities	2/14%	6/43%	9/53%
	English Language Learners	0	0	1/25%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39/41%	59/62%	58/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/45%	32/64%	31/58%
	Students With Disabilities	2/10%	9/45%	9/41%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43/45%	65/69%	74/75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/41%	30/60%	37/71%
	Students With Disabilities	6/30%	8/40%	12/55%
	English Language Learners	0	1/50%	0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40/50%	46/60%	55/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/39%	17/46%	22/54%
	Students With Disabilities	5/28%	6/33%	10/53%
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	40/50%	48/63%	57/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/42%	18/50%	24/59%
	Students With Disabilities	7/39%	9/53%	1-/53%
	English Language Learners	-	-	-

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46/45%	58/57%	62/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/42%	26/57%	27/55%
	Students With Disabilities	5/24%	5/25%	5/24%
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41/40%	68/67%	75/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/34%	30/65%	32/65%
	Students With Disabilities	2/10%	8/40%	9/45%
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	66/75%	89/82%	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/76%	38/75%	-
	Students With Disabilities	7/41%	13/65%	-
	English Language Learners	-	1/100%	-

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	45	47	38	42	31	31	18				
ELL				50							
HSP	64			55							
WHT	71	64	39	75	61	47	58				
FRL	63	56	40	65	55	36	49				
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	33	43	43	35	45	37	40				
ELL	31			62							
HSP	58	43		57	43		62				
MUL	75			75							
WHT	70	59	48	70	61	43	68				

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
FRL	58	56	39	61	58	39	61				
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	29	39	39	38	41	31	27				
ELL	20			60							
HSP	53	59		71	59		54				
WHT	63	56	46	72	68	52	63				
FRL	54	52	44	64	60	44	52				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
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	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	50
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	
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	60
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	59
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The trend we found in our assessment data was a decline in our bottom 25% performance in both ELA and Math. We also saw a decrease in Science proficiency. In the area of ELA our 5th grade students showed that 58% performed on level 3 or higher. Historically East has maintained an average of 71% with Math proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The Bottom 25 on both ELA and Math minimal growth demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

In the current Master Schedule the Tier 2 intervention is allotted to bottom 25% students. However, the Master schedule doesn't have a Math Tier 2 intervention time designated for each grade level. Professional development using the math program, Do the Math, would be used during this time as the evidence based program.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

4th grade ELA showed the most improvement in the state assessments with an increase of 12%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our master schedule allowed for the STAR invention room to be focused as a Tier 2 intervention with the program LLI. This was in addition to classroom ELA instruction and daily guided reading.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The implementation of the programs SIPPS, LLI, and Orton Gillingham with fidelity as Tier 2 interventions. Introducing the Do the Math program as a Tier 2 intervention into 3,4, and 5th grade classrooms. The master schedule also allotted for an additional 60 minutes for Tier 2 and 3 intervention time.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We have numerous professional development opportunities planned for both our instructional and support staff this school year. For our instructional staff we are offering training with Do the Math and continued support with the ELA programs SIPPS and LLI. For our support staff we are offering specific LLI training to ensure the program is being used in its entirety. We are also providing additional PD for teachers with the focus on EDIS and putting purposeful interventions in place for our bottom 25%.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional Reading Recovery teachers were added this school year. We are also adding Do the Math into classroom instruction for lowest Math performing students. Moving forward in the years to come we will set the goal to add additional instructional coaches to support both Reading and Math.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

The area of focus is ELA lowest 25% gains. This specific area had zero point growth from 2019 to Spring 2021 data.

Measurable Outcome:

On the 2022 ELA FSA, the percentage of our students making learning gains in the area of L25 will increase from 43% to 54% proficiency.

Monitoring:

LLI and SIPPS assessments will be used to measure percentage of learning gains in bottom 25%. ESE students who fall within this area will also be monitored with the same evidence-based programs. Benchmark Interim Assessments and STAR data will also be monitored to measure learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Lynch (lori.lynch@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

STAR 360 Monitoring Assessments, LLI, SIPPS will be used during both Tier 2 and Tier 3 ELA times as the evidence-based strategy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

STAR 360 Monitoring Assessments has shown a close correlation to FSA student performance. The LLI and SIPPS programs are programs that allow students to be assessed frequently and with increased rigor based off lessons. LLI has a strong ESSA rating and SIPPS has demonstrated success in other LEA schools.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assess all students with STAR 360 assessment and identify the bottom 25%.

Person Responsible

Cassandra Cleary (cassandra.cleary@yourcharlotteschools.net)

2. Create 30 minute group rotations as dictated in the master schedule at Tier 2 intervention time. For ESE inclusion sessions will be labeled at Tier 3 interventions on schedule.

Person Responsible

Lori Lynch (lori.lynch@yourcharlotteschools.net)

3. During Tier 2 and Tier 3 time students will receive intensive ELA instruction through the use of SIPPS, LLI, or Orton Gillingham. A selection of first grade students who were assessed will receive Reading Recovery lessons daily.

Person Responsible

Lori Lynch (lori.lynch@yourcharlotteschools.net)

During progress monitoring and formative assessment groups will be altered based upon student need. If necessary MTSS process will be started for students not making targeted growth.

Person Responsible

Cassandra Cleary (cassandra.cleary@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Throughout the school year professional development will be offered to support teachers in the MTSS process and the use of EDIS. Teachers will meeting with mental health staff to check for correct data tracking of bottom performing students.

Person Responsible Karisa Wideikis (karisa.wideikis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Monthly child talk meetings will take place with core team member as case manager. All conversations will be documented in shared Google doc. Administration will monitor all discussions of bottom 25% students.

Person Responsible Melissa White (melissa.white@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Focus Description and Rationale: Historically, our school has averaged at 70% in math achievement. However, 44% for math learning gains of the lowest 25%. Our learning gains from the 2020-2021 school year were 43% gains.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal for the 2020-2021 school year will be to increase our lowest 25% in math from 43% C to 54% B.

Monitoring: This area will be monitored by STAR 360 progress monitoring and other formative assessments from the Ready Classroom math curriculum.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cassandra Cleary (cassandra.cleary@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Do the Math will be the main program that will be used to provide Tier 2 math intervention for low 25% students. Reflex Math will be used school wide to build math fluency across all operations. Freckle will be used to create an individualized learning path for each student. Comprehensive Math Framework will outline the instructional components necessary for a well rigorous and standard driven math lesson.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We are using evidence based programs to aide us in achieving our 54% learning gains for bottom 25%. Programs being used: 1. Comprehensive Math Framework 2. STAR 360 3. Freckle 4. Reflex 5. Do the Math- these programs have promising evidence as defined by ESSA and have demonstrated success in other LEA elementary schools when used regularly as an intervention for students.

Action Steps to Implement

During Math block students in high need grade levels will be pulled for Do the Math math intervention program. Number of groups will be based upon available kits and support personnel.

Person Responsible: Melissa White (melissa.white@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Classroom teachers will monitor and alter students Freckle math path according to their area of weakness. This will be monitored following progress monitoring three times a year or as needed for MTSS purposes.

Person Responsible: Cassandra Cleary (cassandra.cleary@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teachers lesson plans will be checked weekly to ensure that differentiation within math groups is taking place at least 4 days a week.

Person Responsible: Kim Blondun (kim.blondun@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Throughout the school year professional development will be offered to support teachers in the MTSS process and the use of EDIS. Teachers will meet with mental health staff to check for correct data tracking of bottom performing students.

Person Responsible: Karisa Wideikis (karisa.wideikis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Monthly child talk meetings will take place with core team member as case manager. All conversations will be documented in shared Google doc. Administration will monitor all discussions of bottom 25% students.

Person Responsible Melissa White (melissa.white@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is ELA and Math Achievement for SWD. SWD showed overall 56% achievement and 54% learning gains in ELA. In Math achievement students performed at 53% and 48% in learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: On the 2022 ELA FSA students will increase proficiency in Math from 48% to 53% and in ELA 54% to 59%.

Monitoring: SWD will be assessed during the school year with the use of DRA, Benchmark, APM (3-5), STAR 360 and other formative assessments used in instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cindy Brooks (cindy.brooks@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: ESE teacher will meet with students daily for small group inclusion instruction, STAR 360 Progress Monitoring, Freckly, LLI, Orton Gillinham, and SIPPS will be used in daily instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: During their daily instruction ESE teachers will provide specific instruction based on students needs. After data is gathered teachers will provide an individualized learning path for students. Teachers will also push into classroom for additional support if their schedule allows.

Action Steps to Implement

During WIN time, paraprofessionals will push in to classrooms to provide additional instruction to support SWD.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Targeted, focused, individualized instructional strategies will be developed during IEP meetings.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

During instruction students will use LLI, SIPPS, or Orton Gillingham if more intensive instruction is needed in reading components.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

The Reading Coach and Lead Teacher will provide coaching and mentoring to teachers, assess students, and coordinate and/or provide PD in the area of ELA.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

ESE teachers will be given each Friday to meet with ESE liaison, attend IEP meetings, meet with teachers to provide support for ESE students in classroom.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

In comparison with state data East Elementary ranks "very low" in discipline incidents. When examining the data more closely the area of aggressive touching was the incident with the most occurrences. Our PBIS looks closely at our discipline data at each monthly meeting. Our PBIS action plan will also focus on a more proactive approach with school discipline. Monthly PBIS school events will be planned, the Eagle Buck token system will be used, and Sanford Harmony will be reinforced with teachers as a tier 1 intervention.

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.

The school strives to have a welcoming and positive culture that positively effects the school's academic achievement. We address this by involving our entire staff in professional learning communities that encompass more than our school's direct stakeholders. Our school has also placed a great emphasis on PBIS events this year with the use of our school wide positive behavior initiative, Eagle Bucks. This program allows all EES staff to contribute to a teacher made goal for each classroom.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

This year's goals in promoting a positive culture encompass all stakeholders equally. We support our teacher's class goals and Tier 1 classroom management policies by constant visits to classroom and creating of school wide PBIS monthly events. Our parents are informed of school wide events so that they may encourage their children with appropriate behavior. We will strive to include our community by offering ways for them to participate in monthly PBIS events. Family nights will also be held through the school year. All parents will be invited to join both our PTO and SAC meeting that will be held both in person and virtually. East will continue to use the following methods to keep parents involved in upcoming events: Remind app, written newsletter, schools