Charlotte County Public Schools

Myakka River Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Myakka River Elementary School

12650 WILLMINGTON BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33981

http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/mre

Demographics

Principal: Grace Tollefson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
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: C (49%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (61%)
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 was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/12/2021.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Myakka River Elementary School

12650 WILLMINGTON BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33981

http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/mre

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	93%

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

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/12/2021.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

School Mission: Myakka River Elementary is a caring family and community growing M.I.G.H.T.Y. leaders to achieve academic excellence.
School Motto: Believe, Lead, and Achieve
Expectations: Motivated, Inspired, Grateful, Helpful, Thoughtful, You Make a Difference (MIGHTY)
Relentlessly pursuing higher achievement!

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tollefson, Grace	Principal	Grace Shepard serves as the school Principal. She oversees the entire staff in providing professional, educational leadership. This is completed through PLC's, PD's, Data Days, Staff and Faculty meetings, and/or Instructional Leader meetings. Within these meetings, collaborative shared decision making is practiced. She serves on the School Advisory Committee, as well as Co-chairing the Partnership and Performance Committee. She summarizes data to assist teachers and students with learning needs and is responsible for the development of the school's master schedule and school events calendar. Additionally, the Principal oversees the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. She shares the responsibility for all communication disseminated from the school, analyzes and articulates data and shares in the safety of all persons on campus. The principal uses leadership, supervisory, and administrative skills to promote the educational development and well-being of each student. The principal acts as liaison between the school and the community, interpreting activities and policies of the school and encouraging community participation in school life. Completes walkthroughs to ensure instructional continuity and provides feedback and coaching to promote teacher efficacy.
Magill, Ryane	Assistant Principal	Ryane Magill serves as the school Assistant Principal. She assists the Principal with professional and educational needs of the staff, students, and families of Myakka River Elementary. She Co-chairs the Support Staff Partnership and Performance Committee and serves as Team Leader for the Positive Behavior Intervention and Support Committee. She assists with the MTSS process for all grade levels. She is a member of the Parent Teacher Organization and shares the responsibility of all disciplinary instances. Furthermore, she provides leadership for the ELL program at our school. Completes walkthroughs to ensure instructional continuity and provides feedback and coaching to promote teacher efficacy.
Dillmore, Carrie	Other	Carrie Dillmore serves as the school Lead Teacher. She supports teachers in the classroom and with the analysis of data and the reporting process. She provides professional development for our staff in the areas of curriculum and instruction, as well as Professional Learning opportunities. Additionally, she is a TST coach for grades 4-5 and is an Instructional Coach for all teachers as needed. She is the NET teacher coordinator.
Smith, Nicole	Instructional Coach	Reading Coaches will serve as a school-based, K-5 resource for professional development, progress monitoring, and student data analysis leading to improvements in reading instruction and achievement. They will provide coaching while working directly with teachers, principals, and other staff to best meet the needs of the students and school as directed by the principal.
Pellerito, Colleen	Reading Coach	Reading Coaches will serve as a school-based, K-5 resource for professional development, progress monitoring, and student data analysis leading to improvements in reading

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		instruction and achievement. They will provide coaching while working directly with teachers, principals, and other staff to best meet the needs of the students and school as directed by the principal. This coach will facilitate the MTSS process and coach teachers through the process. Specializes in interventions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2016, Grace Tollefson

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

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.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
40

Total number of students enrolled at the school
575

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
11

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	94	101	105	84	95	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	567
Attendance below 90 percent	2	20	18	18	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	10	11	8	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 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	79	86	61	66	64	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
Attendance below 90 percent	8	13	13	7	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	5	2	5	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	79	86	61	66	64	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
Attendance below 90 percent	8	13	13	7	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	5	2	5	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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				63%	62%	57%	58%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	57%	58%	52%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				28%	50%	53%	45%	41%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	63%	63%	60%	65%	62%
Math Learning Gains				48%	54%	62%	51%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	42%	51%	39%	39%	47%
Science Achievement				56%	54%	53%	62%	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	78%	69%	9%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	56%	-3%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	65%	70%	-5%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	60%	-2%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	56%	52%	4%	53%	3%
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), Reaissance (STAR Early Literacy, Reading and Math) and USATestprep Science

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34/34%	39/41%	45/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/27%	23/33%	28/38%
	Students With Disabilities	2/8%	2/8%	3/13%
	English Language Learners	1/25%	1/33%	2/50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42/43%	53/56%	43/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27/40%	36/53%	29/39%
	Students With Disabilities	5/22%	5/21%	5/20%
	English Language Learners	3/74%	0/0%	2/50%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35/53%	44/66%	52/71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/40%	19/58%	25/66%
	Students With Disabilities	3/20%	4/33%	9/56%
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/27%	42/64%	49/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/19%	16/50%	24/63%
	Students With Disabilities	2/13%	5/45%	5/31%
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/100%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	24/36%	40/53%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/32%	19/49%	
	Students With Disabilities	4/25%	8/44%	
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	10/15%	42/56%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/9%	19/49%	
	Students With Disabilities	3/19%	8/44%	
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	16/25%	28/40%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/26%	21/48%	
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/17%	
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	5/8%	35/50%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/8%	22/50%	
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	3/25%	
	English Language Learners	1/33%	2/67%	

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34/37%	48/50%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/32%	21/44%	
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	4/36%	
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/33%	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/9%	29/31%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/9%	22/50%	
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	2/18%	
	English Language Learners	1/33%	1/33%	
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60/69%	68/76%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/63%	32/71%	
	Students With Disabilities	5/63%	5/50%	
	English Language Learners	1/33%	1/33%	

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	33	33		53	50		42				
ELL	64			69			50				
HSP	67	83		62	71		56				
MUL	67			67							
WHT	60	59	55	68	56	57	64				
FRL	59	70	77	64	56	47	55				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	42	30	19	35	33	29	29				
ELL	54			62							
HSP	66	60		50	57		40				
WHT	62	47	27	61	46	37	57				

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	60	42	17	52	38	23	57				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	28	48	50	29	41	37	55				
ELL	45			64							
HSP	52	50		36	33	30					
WHT	59	52	40	63	53	41	62				
FRL	51	53	47	53	47	39	49				

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	61
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	424
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	61
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	68
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	67
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	60
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	61
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?

We saw improvement in all grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas. There was a greater increase in learning gains for reading than in math. We saw higher achievement in math than in reading. There was an increase in 5th grade science proficiency as well. Fourth grade was our lowest achieving grade level on FSA assessments.

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

Bottom quartile learning gains in math was are 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?

We did not have a strong tier 3 math intervention in place during the 2019 school year. We have Do the Math intervention materials and will be providing PD on how to implement the program with our L25 math students.

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

L25 learning gains in ELA showed the most improvement.

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

Consistent tier 1 instruction, collaboration with ELA teachers, strong evidence based tier 2 and tier 3 intervention materials. Adhered to the district provided pacing guides and critical concepts.

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

We will be implementing critical concepts in grades K-5. Use LLI and Do the Math to accelerate student learning. Use all components of district adopted reading materials to instruct and assess all students.

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.

According to the Comprehensive Evidenced Based Reading Plan, professional development for teachers will be differentiated and intensified based on progress monitoring data on school based data days. These data days will be scheduled following each progress monitoring window. Teachers will meet formally in grade level teams in the mornings to analyze and review data. In the afternoons, differentiated professional learning based on student performance and teacher need will be provided by one or more of the following: Curriculum and instructional specialists, lead teachers, reading coaches. This PD will be focused on how to use LLI and Do the Math to accelerate student learning.

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

After each district wide progress monitoring window, the district psychometrician shares data with each school so that decisions can be made on appropriate tiered interventions for students. This progress monitoring data is coupled with student performance on classroom formative assessments and teacher observation. Utilizing the data and the MTSS problem solving model, the identification of the component of reading that requires remediation are determined.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our sub category of students with disabilities scored at 31%.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to move from 31% to 42%.
Monitoring:	This area will be monitored using district assessments. SWD percent proficient will be compared to the percent proficient of student without disabilities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ryane Magill (ryane.magill@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusion model services will be provided for all students with disabilities. Students will receive targeted ESE push in support with a clear focus for each lesson. The teacher will teach explicitly and tell them what they need to know and show them how to do it.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our goal is to provide the most inclusive environment for our students with disabilities to be successful. To make up for what's been lost, we need to focus on acceleration not remediation. SWD will be provided with challenging instruction at grade level ensuring they have an opportunity to interact with high quality curriculum. Florida statute 1003.57(1)(a)(2) The school district shall use the term inclusion shall mean a student is receiving education in a general education regular class setting. Robert Marzano claims it is important to explicitly teach your students the things they need to learn. John Hattie states the importance of explicitly teaching a carefully sequenced curriculum, with built in cumulative practice and using worked examples.

Action Steps to Implement

Maximize push-in support through scheduling

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

Utilize support from the ESE Liaison including job descriptions for VE teachers and the classroom teachers.

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

Understand student IEPs and appropriate accommodations listed

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

Apply accommodations during all testing situations throughout the school year.

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

Instruct grade level standards based content for all ESE students explicitly "tell and show"

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practice related to standards-aligned instruction is an area of focus because it will increase learning for gains for all ELA and Math. Our 5 year average of our students making learning gains for ELA is 57%. Our 5 year average in math learning gains is 57%. Our data in this category shows that our instruction is reaching the average learner, however our highest and lowest quartile of students are not making learning gains consistently.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to move our learning gains average in ELA from 57% to 60% on the ELA FSA. Our goal is to move our learning gains average in Math from 57% to 60% on the Math FSA.
Monitoring:	We will use benchmark, ready math quizzes, LLI assessment kits, DIBELS, DRA, and APM assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ryane Magill (ryane.magill@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use leadership notebooks to set individual student expectations related to grade level standards and critical concepts and provide formative evaluation to monitor student progress toward those goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of setting expectations with students is supported by John Hattie's Highly Effective strategies described in the book Visible Learning because the change in achievement related to that intervention is a 1.44 yield. The use of formative evaluation with students is supported by John Hattie's Highly Effective strategies described in the book Visible Learning because the change in achievement related to that intervention is a .9 yield.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Set up leadership notebooks (goals are based on critical concepts)

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

2. Review BOY data with student and set goals (use benchmark or APM data or fluency or DRA or ready math unit assessments)

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

3. Group students by instructional needs for remediation or enrichment (skills or strategies)

Person Responsible	Colleen Pellerito (colleen.pellerito@yourcharlotteschools.net)

4. Provide practice in skill based groups (Benchmark, DO the MATH, Level Literacy, scholastic books, Ready Math)

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

5. Assess formatively and provide feedback toward goal

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

6.Teachers will continue to progress monitor and adjust groups based on APM, Benchmark, critical concepts and common assessment data.

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

7. Teachers will attend collaborative planning meetings twice a month where they will analyze common assessments, review curriculum pacing guides, determine instructional strategies and tools that will be used for delivery of instruction.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With many new resources being introduced and implemented to align with BEST standards teacher will need differentiated professional development to ensure instructional continuity and meet the variety of student needs.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to move our learning gains average in ELA from 57% to 60% on the ELA FSA. Our goal is to move our learning gains average in Math from 57% to 60% on the Math FSA.
Monitoring:	We will monitor initial training through PD attendance and monitor implementation and application through walkthrough data collection.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our professional development will engage our teachers in supportive, job-embedded, instructionally-focused, collaborative and differentiated ongoing opportunities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the learning policy institute effective professional development is content focused, Incorporates active learning utilizing adult learning theory, Supports collaboration, typically in job-embedded contexts, Uses models and modeling of effective practice, Provides coaching and expert support, Offers opportunities for feedback and reflection, and Is of sustained duration.

Action Steps to Implement

Developed a yearly PD plan to meet staff and instructional needs related to our achievement goals.

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

Initial LLI and Do the Math (Tier 3) PD

Person Responsible	Colleen Pellerito (colleen.pellerito@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Ongoing team planning (PLCs) to ensure quality instruction and assessment

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

Individualized PD related to curriculum and instruction for all staff members

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

Ongoing training of marzano elements of instruction

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

Modeling and Coaching for New Educators

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

Modeling and Coaching Cycles of effective instruction

Person Responsible	Nicole Smith (nicole.smith@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the three year trend, we went from 59% to 56% in Science achievement
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal this year is to go from 56% to 63%.
Monitoring:	We will use USATestprep to monitor science performance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carrie Dillmore (carrie.dillmore@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers in grades K through 5 will use science inquiry vocabulary in direct, clear, repetitive, instruction presenting meaning and contextual examples with multiple exposures.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The district goal was to increase science achievement. Instructional practice specifically relating to Science vocabulary according to visible learning for literacy has a high effect size strategy of .67.

Action Steps to Implement

Follow the Pearson Elevate Pacing Guide for K-4. 5th grade will follow Science Critical Concepts

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

Use Science notebooks daily

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

Display the inquiry vocabulary words in the classroom.

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

Incorporate non-fiction science text from the media center, Science leveled readers & K-2 Reading A to Z books into your Science/ELA block.

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

Follow the district assessment calendar for Science assessments. Specific to vocabulary:
Connection—new to the known, building that "semantic network" in the mind/brain
Use—academic speaking and writing as we construct and apply knowledge (not simply memorize or match, multiple choice,!etc)

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

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current 5th grade students performed at 49% proficient on the 2021 FSA ELA. This left 51 percent of our students with a score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment. Based on this criteria we were identified by the RAISE (Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence) program for additional support. 51% of our current 4th and 5th grade students performed below a level 3 on the 2021 ELA FSA Assessment. Based on the 2021 progress monitoring for K-3 41% of our students are not on track to score a level 3 or above on the statewide assessment. The current cohort of students who are in 2nd grade have 56% of their students who are not on track to score a level 3 or above on the 3rd grade ELA state assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to move the cohort of students currently in 5th grade from 49% proficient to 59% in ELA. We also want to move our current cohort of students in 2nd grade from 44 % proficient to 53% proficient in ELA. Our goal is to increase the number of students in grades K-5 from 54% proficient to 60% proficient using this year's progress monitoring tools.
Monitoring:	We will use Benchmark Advanced assessment, LLI assessments, DIBELS, and APM assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher will clearly articulate learning intention and success criteria throughout their ELA block using grade level benchmarks and critical concepts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of John Hattie's High Effect size strategy of Teacher Clarity is described in the book Visible Learning for Literacy. It has an effect size impact of .75. The use of formative evaluation with students is supported by John Hattie's Highly Effective strategies described in the book Visible Learning for Literacy because the change in achievement related to that intervention is a .9 yield.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborate with teachers during planning to analyze data in order to group students by instructional needs. With a specific focus on students who are on the verge of proficiency. Skills and strategies will be clearly articulated for this group to accelerate learning. (Tier 2)

Person Responsible	Colleen Pellerito (colleen.pellerito@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teachers will ensure that students will be able to answer and ask these three questions for every lesson related to the district adopted high quality instructional materials:
1. What am I learning today?
2. Why am I learning this?
3. How will I know that I learned it? (How will my teacher know that I learned it?)

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

Ongoing training of Marzano elements of instruction specifically related to Teacher Clarity.

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

Teachers will attend collaborative planning meetings twice a month where they will analyze common assessments, review curriculum pacing guides, determine instructional strategies and tools that will be used for delivery of instruction. Through this process students needing additional supports will be identified and interventions will be created and monitored to accelerate learning. (MTSS)

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

Literacy Leadership Team will meet monthly to review ELA progress across all grade levels with a specific focus on our 5th grade cohort.

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

The principal will facilitate learning walks specific to ELA instruction and will work collaboratively with the other elementary principals. This will help us identify high quality instruction or model classrooms where we can send teachers in need of Professional Development to observe ELA instruction. Administration and coaches will provide ongoing in the moment coaching and or feedback to ELA teachers.

Person Responsible Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@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.

Aggressive touching is the primary area of concern and Class Disruption is the secondary area of concern. This year we will focus on implementing CHAMPS in our non-instructional settings such as cafeteria and playground to decrease our referrals for aggressive touching. We are providing reteaching interventions with the guidance counselor with specific students to address our tier 2 and tier 3 students. We are implementing a reshaping behavior strategy with the recommendation of our behavior specialist to decrease class disruptions. Discipline data will be pulled in focus monthly and shared with the core team and PBIS team quarterly.

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 will involve the parents and families in an organized, ongoing, and timely manner, in the planning, review and improvement of Title I programs, including involvement in decision making of how funds for Title I will be used. MRES has formed a Parent Engagement Planning Team which includes two parents, one community member, two teachers, Lead Teacher, Assistant Principal and Title I Paraprofessional. The team used the Title I Family Survey results to identify areas for improvement and created goals to address them. The PFEP will garner support from stakeholders to implement strategies. In the fall, the SAC will review the PFEP and offer suggestions and support. Our SAC will then approve the plan. SAC has the opportunity to have input into our SIP plan. SAC will also approve the SIP. Within the SIP it itemizes how we will spend our Title 1 funds. We will plan events that will increase family involvement in our plan. We will meet quarterly with parents, faculty, staff and administration to allow for implementation and modifications of the Title I Action Plan for Partnerships.

The process by which our school learns about students' cultures and builds relationships between teachers and students is an ongoing process. It begins with our Open House. Additionally, parents and their children actively participate in Data Days, our Family Resource Center usage, and through parent-teacher conferences. Throughout the school year we have family involvement activities such as, PTO/SAC, Fall and Spring Festivals, Math Night, Literacy Night, History Fair Night, and Science Night. Each quarter we hold Student Assemblies where community and business partners, family members of presenters and recipients are invited.

Our staff is actively engaged in monitoring student areas throughout the campus from the time they arrive until the time they leave. Each staff member is trained in identifying whether or not a visitor has the appropriate tag displayed. Our student safety patrol leaders are given the responsibility of monitoring hallways and are trained as well in their respective roles. Our staff treats each child with equity and with respect. There are planned Fire Drills and Active Threat Drills monthly for practice in the case of a real emergency. Our SRO and Guidance Counselor provide in class lessons for all students on the topics of safety, respect for self and others, and bullying and cyber bullying.

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

Administration will facilitate SAC meetings, communicate regularly through newsletters, remind, and Facebook.
Community partners will contribute funds and other resources to support school culture and leadership initiatives.
Teachers will be the first line of contact for all families through planners, remind, phone calls, and email.
Paraprofessionals and office staff will interact with children and families at morning and afternoon duties creating a welcoming and organized school environment. Coaches will encourage, equip, and model best practices for creating positive culture through collaboration.