Meadow Park Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Meadow Park Elementary School

3131 LAKE VIEW BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33948

http://yourcharlotteschools.net/mpe

Demographics

Principal: Lauren Elek

Start Date for this Principal: 7/17/2017

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
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 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%)
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

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	99%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Charlotte County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together We Succeed Through Leadership.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Loge, Matt	Principal	To develop a school wide instructional plan where ALL students' academic needs are met and develop a continuous improvement system to ensure frequent monitoring and evaluation of students data and effective institutional practice. -Develop an effective master schedule to ensure instructional time is valued -Observe and evaluate teacher practice -Create systems and procedures to ensure the Continuous Improvement Model in embedded into the culture of the school -Develop and create a school community which fosters and encourages student and faculty growth -Chair Reading/Literacy Committee which will review school wide reading/ literacy trends, ELA data, and make adjustments school wide as necessary.
Elek, Lauren	Assistant Principal	Assist the Principal in creating a school wide academic plan to address the academic needs of the school. She will also assist Principal in monitoring the effectiveness of instructional practices and the status and growth of all students. -Develop an effective master schedule to ensure instructional time is valued -Observe and evaluate teacher practice -Create systems and procedures to ensure the Continuous Improvement Model in embedded into the culture of the school -Develop and create a school community which fosters and encourages student and faculty growth
Smith-Jaekel, Jessica	Instructional Coach	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.
Bishop, Bo	School Counselor	To oversee the MTSS process and to ensure the Multi-Tiered Support System is fluid, organized, and structured to ensure students are appropriately identified and provided with the necessary systems of academic and behavioral support.
Wolfe, Jill	Teacher, ESE	-Will implement L25 acceleration groups in reading math for grades 4 and 5. -Will meet with administration on a monthly basis to review ELA/Math data for L25 groups. Will adjust instruction accordingly to meet the needs to students in this sub group.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/17/2017, 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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

684

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

7

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

7

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	103	106	112	117	130	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	684
Attendance below 90 percent	1	29	4	28	22	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	2	8	0	6	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	12	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	10	11	11	12	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	2	2	5	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

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	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	

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	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	

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				59%	62%	57%	56%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	57%	58%	49%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	50%	53%	39%	41%	48%
Math Achievement				60%	63%	63%	55%	65%	62%
Math Learning Gains				58%	54%	62%	42%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	42%	51%	27%	39%	47%
Science Achievement				63%	54%	53%	67%	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	67%	69%	-2%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	57%	-13%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	56%	1%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	69%	70%	-1%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	56%	-6%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	61%	52%	9%	53%	8%
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 (APM Reading and Math), Renaissance (STAR Early Literacy, Reading and Math) , Curriculum Associates (iReady Reading and Math), and USATestprep Science

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21/24%	23/25%	39/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/21%	13/20%	24/35%
	Students With Disabilities	5/19%	4/15%	6/23%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13/14%	36/40%	45/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/11%	21/36%	26/41%
	Students With Disabilities	2/11%	5/29%	6/35%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35/38%	45/49%	56/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/35%	25/43%	35/56%
	Students With Disabilities	2/11%	2/11%	4/24%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13/14%	36/40%	45/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/11%	21/36%	26/41%
	Students With Disabilities	2/11%	5/29%	6/35%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45/38%	56/48%	61/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/25%	25/41%	29/46%
	Students With Disabilities	4/13%	4/13%	6/21%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31/26%	65/57%	54/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/25%	25/41%	29/46%
	Students With Disabilities	4/13%	4/13%	6/21%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41/45%	43/48%	50/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/40%	25/42%	36/51%
	Students With Disabilities	2/6%	4/13%	8/23%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30/33%	45/49%	44/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/32%	33/53%	29/42%
	Students With Disabilities	6/19%	8/27%	8/24%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32/37%	40/45%	42/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/34%	21/43%	21/38%
	Students With Disabilities	7/35%	8/35%	7/25%
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31/36%	42/47%	55/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/30%	21/43%	29/52%
	Students With Disabilities	5/25%	9/39%	13/46%
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55/68%	68/76%	-
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/64%	35/69%	-
	Students With Disabilities	10/48%	11/46%	-
	English Language Learners	-	-	-

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	32	45	46	37	57	57	33				
ELL	57			79							
BLK	55	55		65	45		50				
HSP	59	53		61	53		65				
MUL	68			58							
WHT	56	55	50	64	64	60	67				
FRL	54	47	44	60	57	57	60				
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				

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
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				

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	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	68
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	54
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	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	54
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?

-ELA achievement has been stagnant across grade levels although some improvement has been made.
-ESE students, especially those labeled as EBD, continue to perform below their grade level peers in ELA/Math achievement.
-SWD students perform below the district in ELA/Math achievement.
-Writing is an area of weakness across grade levels and subgroups when analyzing monthly writing prompt data for grades K-5 over the past several years. Furthermore, when analyzing 2018/19 FSA ELA data our writing scores for 4th and 5th grade had several areas of concerns.
-Science achievement continues to be a strength across grade levels and sub-groups.
-Math achievement and learning gains across grade levels has shown consistent improvement. We continue to infuse "Reflex Math" beginning in second grade to enhance and improve math fact fluency.
-There is an achievement gap between ELA/Math achievement where Math achievement is outpacing ELA achievement.

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

-The FSA trends over the past several years have shown that the L25 sub group for gains in ELA have been stagnant with the percentage never increasing over 50% percent.
-Progress monitoring data shows that first and second grade lags behind the district in the area of ELA and Math achievement.
-Students in grade three are making fewer gains compared to the district in the area of ELA as noted on the 2020/21 STAR.
-There is a gap between ELA/Math achievement for grades 3-5 as noted on the last two years of FSA data.
-ELA and Math achievement for SWD students is below the district average. However, the gains in ELA/Math for SWD students has shown progress and growth.
-Writing scores for fourth and fifth grades shown a need for growth.
-Meadow Park was not designated a TSI/CSI as all subgroups performed at 41% and above (2019 FSA). After analyzing the 2021 FSA scores, it appears SWD maintained at least a 41%. However, ELA/Math/Science achievement is an area of concern.

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

-SWD students were provided additional 45 minutes of ELA/Reading support on a daily basis. The number of students in the intervention groups might have hindered the progress needed for increased learning gains especially in grades four and five.
-Intervention teachers provided much of the intensive remediation in reading and math and at times groups exceeded an effective level for maximum engagement.
-The lack of a comprehensive and consistent reading program and curriculum for grades K-5.
-The inexperience of reading instruction amongst staff especially for those teaching in grade three.
Actions for Improvement:
-Reading endorsed teachers will provided Tier II and III intervention for students performing below level in reading.

-All teachers will integrate and infuse Marzano's Critical Concepts for ELA/Math.
-All teachers will provide reading instruction using Benchmark and follow the appropriate district pacing guide and Best standards.
-The Literacy Leadership Team will meet on a monthly basis to analysis school wide ELA achievement and provide grade level teams and administration guidance for future professional development in the area of ELA instruction. The Literacy Leadership Team will also determine if changing in ELA pacing and instruction need to be made based on progress monitoring data.
-Implement a new master schedule for 2021/22 that allows for reading endorsed teachers to provide Tier III reading intervention for students in grades K-5 who are below level in reading.

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

Science achievement continues to be an area of improvement for Meadow Park. Furthermore, learning gains in math and math gains for the L25 group continue to show improvement. Next, math achievement levels are on an upward trend as noted on the last two years of FSA data. Math learning gains for SWD students have steadily increased as well as the learning gains in reading of our L25 SWD students.

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

-Students in the L25 sub group regardless of their designation (ESE, 504, General Education, Low Income, ESOL) are provided with daily additional minutes of mathematics and reading instruction in order to accelerate their learning learning in math and reading.
-Math intervention teachers front load the math lessons for these students ahead of time so they are familiar with the Math standards that will be taught by their classroom teachers ahead of time. Students are provided additional time to preview and learn new Math concepts and skills ahead of time before they are exposed to the standards and skills by the general education classroom teacher.
-Meadow Park has an effective fourth and fifth grade ESE/L25 teacher who has the ability to accelerate the learning for students who are in the L25 subgroup for ELA/Math.
New Actions:
-Infuse guided reading school wide. Primary teachers will be provided PD in the area of running records and guided reading. Guided reading is an expectation for all teachers during the 90 minutes reading block. Students in the L25 subgroup will not only receive guided reading during the 90 minute group on a daily basis, but they will also receive additional guided reading instruction during the iii block.

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

-Implement "Critical Concepts" for ELA/Math instruction.
-Implement "Reading Recovery" for early intervention in first grade which will reduce retention rate in third grade.
-Implement the Best Standards for ELA/Math and use the District's Decision Tree to progress monitor students in the area of reading.
-Teachers in grades K-5 will implement the Best Standards in ELA.
-The Literacy Leadership Team will have a pulse on the acceleration rate for reading at Meadow Park. Important instructional pacing decisions will be made by this committee and recommended to grade level teams. Professional development needs and collaborative planning decisions will be made based on the recommendations of The Literacy Leadership Team.
-Meadow Park will implement the District's CERP plan and ensure high quality of instruction and progress monitoring is imbedded into daily reading instruction.
-(BPIE) SWD students will be provided with specially designed in the core curriculum. The ESE model of inclusion will be used when instructing SWD students in all subject areas. The leadership

team will continue to implement the BPIE and work with Florida Inclusion Network to enhance the ESE inclusion model at Meadow Park.
-Provide "Do the Math" for Tier II/III students in math.
-Tier II/III students in reading, will be provided with an additional 30 minutes of reading instruction on a daily basis.
-Reading endorsed teachers will provide Tier II/III reading interventions using Fountas and Pinnell LLI reading program.
-Learning walks will be provided daily, weekly, and monthly to ensure the school improvement plan is being implemented with fidelity.

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.

-Guided Reading K-5-provide teachers will the skills necessary to implement high yield instructional strategies in the area of guided reading instruction
-Marzono's Critical Concepts- to ensure instructional staff are infusing the Best Standards in the area of Math, Reading, and Science.
-iReady Training-update staff on current changes with iReady and how the program aligns with the Best Standards for Reading and Math.
-Fountas and Pinnell LLI-Ensure Tier II/III guided reading instruction is done effectively and efficiently.
-Dreambox-Provide teachers the skills and knowledge regarding the mathematics supplemental software program, Dreambox.
Benchmark-Unpacking the new reading curriculum for teachers and administrators and to ensure the curriculum is implemented consistently across all grade levels and done with fidelity.
-Canvas Training for the Districts Continuity Plan-In an event that in person is no longer available for student(s), teachers will be able to utilize the Canvas platform to ensure continuity of services so learning can continue.

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

-Continue to implement "Reading Recovery" for early intervention in first grade
-Implement the Best Standards for ELA/Math and use the District's Decision Tree to progress monitor students in the area of reading.
-The Literacy Leadership Team will have a pulse on the acceleration rate for reading at Meadow Park. Important instructional pacing decisions will be made by this committee and recommended to grade level teams. Professional development needs and collaborative planning decisions will be made based on the recommendations of The Literacy Leadership Team.
-Meadow Park will implement the District's CERP plan and ensure high quality of instruction and progress monitoring is made in the area of reading instruction.
-(BPIE) SWD students will be provided with support facilitation and integrated into the general education setting when provided with Tier II/III reading/math interventions. The ESE model of inclusion will be used when instructing SWD students in all subject areas. The leadership team will continue to implement the BPIE and work with Florida Inclusion Network to enhance the ESE inclusion model at Meadow Park.
-Tier II/III students in the area of reading, will be provided with additional 30 minutes of reading instruction on a daily basis and participate in guided reading on a daily basis.
-Reading Recovery will be provided for first grade in order to accelerate achievement in the area of reading. Reading Recovery is shown to significantly lower retention rates in the grade three.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards	
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 4th and 5th grades. Next, there is need to have a comprehensive ELA reading program and curriculum that support the FL Best ELA Standards. Data Review: The overall reading proficiency rate for fourth graders for the 2018/19 school year was 44%. The overall ELA proficiency rate for the grades 3-5 was 59%. For 2017/18 the rate was 56%. The school has not been able to exceed 62% proficiency rate on the spring FSA ELA assessment. When reviewing ELA FSA data over the past several years, our proficiency rates for 4th and 5th grade have been below the District average. Next, when reviewing 2021 FSA data, ELA achievement fell 2 % points (57%) when compared to the 2019 ELA achievement data (59%). Finally, when comparing STAR/iReady data from the past several years, our ELA proficiency data is below the district average. Thus, the area of focus will be to increase ELA achievement for grades K-5.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021/22 school year, ELA proficiency for third, fourth and fifth grades will increase by 5 points as determined by the spring 2022 FSA ELA assessment. By the end of the 2021/22 school year, ELA proficiency for K-2 will increase by 7 points as determined on the EOY iReady assessment.
Monitoring:	-The Literacy Leadership Team will review progress monitoring data (iReady, STAR, DRA, Benchmark, APM) to determine school wide or grade level trends. Based on the review of ELA data, collaborative planning will be adjusted to ensure that learning is accelerated for the determined grade level or subgroup of students. Critical Concepts will be reviewed with grade level teams to determine what areas may need to be re-taught or adjusted. -The school based leadership team will conduct weekly classroom walk throughs to ensure the area of focus is being implemented with fidelity. -The school based leadership team and grade level teams will analyze and review progress monitoring data though out the year to determine the effectiveness of these reading initiatives. -During Collaborative planning, grade level teams, including self-contained ESE teachers will review progress monitoring data for ELA/Math and make actions plans necessary to accelerate the learning of all students and subgroup of students. -The school's PPC committee will review the SIP on a monthly basis to monitor the desired outcome and goals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Infuse Marzano's Critical Concepts and the FL BEST ELA Standards for grades K-5. -Teach and instruct the FL BEST ELA Standards using Benchmark. -Provide a comprehensive guided reading plan that includes daily guided reading instruction for grades K-5.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

-Provide guided reading coaching for primary teachers delivered by our Reading Recovery teachers. RR teachers spend several weeks in our primary classrooms to model guided reading and demonstrate an effective Comprehensive Literacy Framework for the 90 minute reading block.
-Create a master schedule that includes the essential components of the 90 minute reading block.

Grade level teams have increased the use of Marzano's Critical Concepts for planning and instruction and have increased collaboration with one another to plan as grade level teams to ensure each grade level team is pacing together and accelerating learning. With the incorporation of the FL BEST ELA Standards, our teachers need to be able to adopt and implement the newly created "Critical Concepts" for ELA instruction.

Guided reading is an essential part of the the "Comprehensive Literacy Framework" and essential in accelerating the reading progress of all students in grades K-5. It is important that students read print. When conducting "guided reading" walk throughs during the 2020/21 school year, we realized that students didn't read enough words or engaged in the reading of words or print on the students' instructional level.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a guided reading expectation guide for all teachers in grades K-5.

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

Utilizing Title I funds and ESSER funds to purchase additional guided reading books for grades K-5. Utilize ESSER funds to purchase iReady reading/math.

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

Provide guided reading training specifically running record training for K-5 teachers.

Person Responsible Jessica Smith-Jaekel (jessica.smith-jaekel@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Lead Collaborative Planning with grade level teams as it relates to Marzano's Critical Concepts, guided reading lesson plans, Canvas, and Benchmark.

Person Responsible Jessica Smith-Jaekel (jessica.smith-jaekel@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Review common assessment data and progress monitoring data to determine school wide trends or deficiencies.

Person Responsible Lauren Elek (lauren.elek@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Conduct classroom walk throughs to determine the progress of guided reading and Marzano's Critical Concepts into daily reading instruction for grades K-5.

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

Deliver daily Reading Recovery instruction to our targeted deficient first grade readers.

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

#2. Other specifically relating to Learning Gains in ELA and Learning Gains in ELA for L25	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is to enhance the growth and proficiency of reading for students who fall into the lowest 25 percentile according to 2020/21 FSA scores, EOY STAR data 2020/21, and iReady data for the beginning of the 2021/22 school year . This sub group has fallen short of the district and state percentile rankings throughout the past several years for learning gain in ELA and for learning gains for ELA for L25 subgroup. This area is a critical area of focus as we service many students who fall into multiple ESSA categories. Intensive acceleration, remediation and differentiation is essential to ensure our students continue to grow and flourish in the area of reading.
	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 Fountas and Pinnell LLI. Students will be given an additional 45 minutes of reading instruction using LLI. Based on 2020/21 FSA data and BOY 2020/21 iReady Reading data, L25 ELA students will be placed in a Tier II/III reading group. 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 acceleration for ESE students.
	Throughout the 2021/22 school year, teachers will be provided with professional development in the area of "guided reading" by our reading recovery specialists. Most importantly, our Reading Endorsed teachers will provide additional guided reading using Fountas and Pinnell's LLi guided reading program for Tier II/III students or the L25 subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021/22 school year, 55% of students in the Lowest 25 percent will demonstrate a learning gain in ELA based on the 2021/22 FSA ELA assessment exam and the end of the year iReady ELA school based assessment test.
	By the end of the 2021/22 school year, 62% of students in grades 4-5 will demonstrate a learning gain in reading as determined on the 2021/22 FSA ELA assessment.
Monitoring:	-The Literacy Leadership Team will review progress monitoring data (iReady, STAR, DRA, Benchmark, APM) to determine school wide or grade level trends. Based on the review of ELA data, collaborative planning will be adjusted to ensure that learning is accelerated for the determined grade level or subgroup of students.
	-The school based leadership team will conduct weekly classroom walk throughs during reading intervention times to ensure the area of focus is being implemented with fidelity.
	-The school based leadership team and grade level teams will analyze and review progress monitoring data though out the year to determine the effectiveness of these reading initiatives. The team will also review L25 progress monitoring data on a monthly basis with intervention teachers and reading endorsed teachers to determine effectiveness of Fountas and Pinnell's LLI program and the effectiveness of Tier I ELA instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	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. The following evidence based strategies are being

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	implemented to increase ELA learning gains and ELA learning gains for the L25. The two major initiatives provided in this plan meet evidence based criteria as noted in the "Evidence for ESSA" publication. The following evidence based strategies are as follows: -Implement Reading Recovery for deficient first grade readers -Utilize Fountas and Pinnell's LLI to accelerate the reading levels of Tier II/III students -Teach the FL BEST ELA Standards using Benchmark Marzano's Critical Concepts consistently and with fidelity. -Utilize iReady and STAR ELA progress monitoring data to determine the acceleration of students receiving additional reading instruction by reading endorsed teachers. -Infuse the guided reading plan for grades K-5. Guided reading is an essential part of the the "Comprehensive Literacy Framework" and essential in accelerating the reading progress of all students in grades K-5. It is important that students read print. When conducting "guided reading" walk throughs during the 2020/21 school year, we realized that students didn't read enough words or engaged in the reading of words or print on the students' instructional level. Fountas and Pinnell's LLI is an evidence based guided reading program for Tier II/III students. The LLI program provides reading deficient students an opportunity to read text on their instructional level in order to accelerate their reading skills and develop into on grade level readers. The LLI program is used by several successful school districts in the state to improve learning gains in ELA and gain for L25. Reading Recovery accelerates the reading of struggling first graders and lowers the retention rates in third grade.

Action Steps to Implement

Assess and identify the students in L25 for ELA. Form grade level Tier II/III LLI reading groups.

Person Responsible	Lauren Elek (lauren.elek@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Develop a master schedule that enables Reading Endorsed teachers to deliver LLI.

Person Responsible	Lauren Elek (lauren.elek@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Deliver Reading Recovery and Literacy Lessons for targeted first graders.

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

Provide Professional Development and coaching in the area of "guided reading" by trained reading recovery teachers. Model guided reading in the classroom for all primary teachers. Furthermore, provide coaching and modeling of best practices of reading instruction.

Person Responsible	Jessica Smith-Jaekel (jessica.smith-jaekel@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Conduct weekly classroom walk throughs to monitor the implementation of guided reading and LLI intervention groups and the use of Benchmark

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

Provide Professional Development to all teachers utilizing Fountas and Pinnell's LLI guided reading program.

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

Review monthly progress monitoring STAR data of students in the L25 and students in Tier II/III guided reading groups to determine acceleration and growth of L25 students. Review data with teachers who service the L25 students in reading instruction.

Person Responsible   Lauren Elek (lauren.elek@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to Learning Gains in Math and Learning Gains in Math for L25	
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. However, based on the 2020/21 FSA Math results, 60% of students in the L25 made learning gains in math as well as 59% overall made math learning gains. The stark improvement in the area of math learning gains is a reason to continue this area of focus for the 2021/22 school year. Because we have seen a significant growth in this area, we want to continue to focus and stay the coarse in providing additional support for our students in the L25 for math, especially for our SWD students. Many of our ESE, ESOL, 504, and low income students meet the need for additional support in mathematics instruction. Furthermore, based on 2021/22 FSA math data, 40% of SWD students were proficient in math. Therefore, it is important to continue our focus in this area.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021/22 school year, 62% of students in the Lowest 25% (ESE, 504, ESOL, Low Income) will demonstrate a learning gain in Math as demonstrated on the spring 2021/22 FSA math assessment test. By the end of the 2021/22 school year, 54% of our ESE students will proficient in the area of math based on the spring 2021/22 FSA math assessment.
Monitoring:	-The school based leadership team will conduct weekly classroom walk throughs during math intervention times to ensure the area of focus is being implemented with fidelity. (Preview or pre-teach math standards to L25 students before they are exposed to the math concepts during the regular math block). -The school based leadership team will review L25 progress monitoring data on a monthly basis with math intervention teachers. -The school based leadership team will conduct weekly classroom walk throughs during the 60 minute math block to ensure essential math components are evident. (Ready Math, Number Talk, Reflex Math, iReady Math, and DreamBox).
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. Intervention math teachers will collaborate with grade level teams and provide remediation and differentiation for students who are deficient in math. - An additional 30 minute math block has been created to front load math concepts for L25 students before they are exposed to the math standards during the 60 minute math block. -Students will use the online learning tools of DreamBox, Reflex Math, and iReady Math to improve math fact fluency and overall math proficiency. A specific amount of time is designated for each online platform. Teachers will embed these programs into their math centers simultaneously. -Teachers will utilize "Math for Today" to engage students in math reasoning and mathematical discourse. -Utilize "Do the Math' intervention math materials for students in grades K-3.
Rationale for Evidence-	-DreamBox is rated a "Strong" ESSA rating. -Reflex Math has a "Moderate" ESSA rating. However, according to the developers of Reflex, "Studies show statistically significant, positive results for Reflex users, and meet ESSA's Moderate Evidence requirements. Independent, third-party review for two studies

based Strategy:	is also available at The National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII)". -Providing an additional 30 minutes of math instruction for students in the L25 provides additional minutes of math instruction for students who struggle in mathematics. -"Do the Math" intervention math program has an ESSA rating of "Moderate".

Action Steps to Implement

Identify the students in L25 who will receive an additional 30 minutes of math instruction.

Person Responsible	Lauren Elek (lauren.elek@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Create a master schedule to include a 30 minute math intervention block.

Person Responsible	Lauren Elek (lauren.elek@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Using Title I and internal funds, purchase DreamBox and Reflex math.

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

Provide an additional 30 minutes of math instruction for L25 students in fourth and fifth grades.

Person Responsible	Jill Wolfe (jill.wolfe@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Utilize "Do the Math" when providing math remediation for students in grades K-3.

Person Responsible	Jessica Smith-Jaekel (jessica.smith-jaekel@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Review math progress monitoring data for students in L25 in grades K-5 on a monthly basis to determine if instructional or grouping changes need to occur.

Person Responsible	Lauren Elek (lauren.elek@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Provide Reflex, iReady, and DreamBox data to teachers on a monthly basis so that teachers can monitor the use of these highly effective math online tools.

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 2021/22 school year, 41% of our ESE students will be proficient in the area of math based on the spring 2021/22 FSA Math assessment and Math iReady EOY. By the end of the 2021/22 school year, 41% of our ESE students will be proficient in the area of ELA based based on the 2021/22 FSA ELA assessment and ELA iReady EOY.
Monitoring:	-The school based leadership team will conduct weekly classroom walk throughs during math intervention times to ensure the area of focus is being implemented with fidelity. (Preview or pre-teach math standards to L25 students before they are exposed to the math concepts during the regular math block). -The school based leadership team will conduct weekly classroom walk throughs during the 60 minute math block to ensure essential math components are evident. (Ready Math, Number Talk, Reflex Math, iReady Math, and DreamBox). -The school based leadership team and ESE self-contained grade level teams will analyze and review progress monitoring data on a monthly basis through out the year to determine the effectiveness of these reading initiatives. The team will also review L25 progress monitoring data to determine the effectiveness of Fountas and Pinnell's LLI program and the effectiveness of Tier I ELA instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ELA: These research proven intervention programs provide explicit, systematic instruction in the area of phonics, fluency, and comprehension. -Implement Literacy Lessons for deficient ESE readers. -Utilize Fountas and Pinnell's LLI to accelerate the reading levels of Tier II/III students. -Teach the FL BEST ELA Standards using Benchmark consistently and with fidelity. -Utilize iReady and STAR ELA progress monitoring data to determine the acceleration of SWD students. -Infuse the guided reading plan for grades K-5 for all ESE self-contained classrooms. -Infuse FL Benchmark into the 90 minute reading block. Math: -Implement "Dreambox", "Do the MATH", "Reflex Math", "Math for Today", and "Ready Math" curriculum to assist and help SWD students acquire the necessary math skills to be proficient in the area of math. -L25/ESE teacher(s) will front load math standards for ESE students before lesson is

taught in the general education setting.
-ESE teachers will utilize "Do the Math" intervention materials.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
-DreamBox is rated a "Strong" ESSA rating.
-Reflex Math has a "Moderate" ESSA rating. However, according to the developers of Reflex, "Studies show statistically significant, positive results for Reflex users, and meet ESSA's Moderate Evidence requirements. Independent, third-party review for two studies is also available at The National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII)".
-Providing an additional 30 minutes of math instruction for students in the L25 provides additional minutes of math instruction for students who struggle in mathematics.
-"Do the Math" intervention math program has an ESSA rating of "Moderate".
-"Literacy Lessons" (Reading Recovery for ESE Students) has a "Strong" ESEA rating.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a guided reading expectation guide for all teachers in grades K-5.

Person Responsible   Jessica Smith-Jaekel (jessica.smith-jaekel@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Utilizing Title I funds and ESSER funds to purchase additional guided reading books for grades K-5. Utilize ESSER funds to purchase iReady reading/math.

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

Lead Collaborative Planning with grade level teams as it relates to Marzano's Critical Concepts, guided reading lesson plans, Canvas, and Benchmark.

Person Responsible   Jessica Smith-Jaekel (jessica.smith-jaekel@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Provide guided reading training specifically running record training to all ESE and general education teachers.

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

Conduct classroom walk throughs to determine the progress of guided reading and Marzano's Critical Concepts into daily reading instruction for grades K-5 and in self-contained ESE classrooms.

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

Deliver daily Literacy Lessons instruction for targeted deficient ESE students.

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

Utilize Fountas and Pinnell's LLI to provided differentiated guided reading instruction for SWD students.

Person Responsible   Jill Wolfe (jill.wolfe@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Purchase "Do the Math", "Dreambox", "iReady Reading/Math", and "Reflex Math" with Title I funds and ensure instructional materials are being used with SWD students.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Meadow Park Elementary School is ranked 199 out of 1,395 schools in the state which ranks as "Very Low". Meadow Park reported 0.1 incidents per 100 students which again ranks it as "Very Low". The notable area of improvement has been in the area of student suspension rates. Since 2014, the number of suspensions of dropped each year. In 2014, there were 64 reported suspensions to 35 for 2019. An area of improvement would be incidents of "property". The area of concern is directly related to the Emotional Disability Unit that is located at Meadow Park. SWD students with Behavior Intervention Plans and or Functional Behavior Assessments account for the majority of incidents in this category. The school has worked closely with the ESE department and ESE staff to provide professional development in the area of de-escalation techniques and improve ways to deescalate students with emotional disabilities. The school continues to provide intensive support for students with emotional disabilities by providing a full time behavior specialist, a full time social worker, and a full time school psychologist. The school will rely on the services of these specialists to provide small group guidance and individual support in order to have decreased "property" incidents. Furthermore, the school will continue to incorporate Positive Behavior Support for Tier I behavior. The "PBS" team meets on a monthly basis to determine and plan school wide PBS events. The school leadership team (Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor, School Psychologist, Social Worker, SRO) meet on a monthly basis to review monthly discipline data and determine areas of concern on campus. Supervision schedules and student support groups are adjusted based on discipline data. Furthermore, the team functions as the "Threat Assessment Team" to identify students of concern and provide the necessary supports for at risk students when necessary.

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.

Meadow Park will conduct monthly SAC meetings and parent volunteer meetings to build 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, math, and science. 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 Cub Scouts, the Girls on the Run. We continue to focus on building relationships and fostering school and community partnerships.

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

PBS Committee- The PBS committee is responsible for providing recognition for students who make good choices behaviorally and provide school wide recognition to students on a quarterly basis. The committee plans and implements Tier I behavioral celebrations to recognize and celebrate the positive choices students make. These school wide celebration contribute to promoting a positive school culture.

School Leadership and PTO- The school based leadership team work with the Parent/Teacher Organization to plan school and family events and to foster positive school and community relationships. The school sponsored PTO events promote a positive school environment and culture where the school and families come together to celebrate the traditions of the school. The PTO fosters and encourages positive family and school relationships in order to promote a positive school culture.

SAC Committee- It shares the mission and vision of the school and provides support and guidance in the area of school improvement as it relates to the school improvement plan and parent and family engagement.

School Administration- Works with and seeks the support of local agencies and organizations (churches, Boy Scouts, Girls on the Run) who provide support and resources for the improvement of the school.