Meadow Park Elementary School

2022-23 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: 7/12/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan 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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together We Succeed Through Leadership.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities**:**

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
Meerman, Meridith	Instructional Coach	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. In charge of the planning of school based PD and assist in the delivery of state wide assessments
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. Organize 504 meetings and is the key contact person for ELL screening and 504 documentation.
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.
Martin, Katie	Dean	-Oversee Tier I, II school wide behavior and manage student discipline and conduct. Responsible for participating in PBIS committee and assisting school administration with the supervision and management of Tier I/II student behavior and conduct.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/12/2022, Lauren Elek

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

Total number of students enrolled at the school
700

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
45

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	95	115	120	119	114	131	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	694
Attendance below 90 percent	2	33	33	28	30	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	2	2	8	4	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	26	9	7	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	2	4	21	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	3	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/15/2022

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	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

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	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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	59%	56%				59%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						52%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						41%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	65%	48%	50%				60%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	63%						58%	54%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						52%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	65%	59%				63%	54%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	67%	69%	-2%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	57%	-13%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	56%	1%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	69%	70%	-1%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	50%	56%	-6%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

			SCIENCE			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	61%	52%	9%	53%	8%

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

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	25	35	41	49	60	65	29				
ELL	44	63		63	88						
BLK	57	56		60	83						
HSP	47	49	45	60	67	64	58				
MUL	63	65		76	75		75				
WHT	54	58	47	65	58	50	68				
FRL	52	51	49	59	60	51	60				

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				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	85
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	492
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	69
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	64
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	71
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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. We saw a drop in 3rd grade specially as a result of staffing issues.
-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.
-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. We saw an increase in overall math proficiency. We implemented Dreambox math this year in grades K-5 with much sucess.
-There is an achievement gap between ELA/Math achievement where Math achievement is outpacing ELA achievement.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 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 2021/22 STAR assessment.
-There is a gap between ELA/Math achievement for grades 3-5 as noted on the last several 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 (2022 FSA). After analyzing the 2022 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.
-Benchmark ELA materials came in late September, early October.
-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.
-Implement "Reading Plus" supplemental reading software program to assist mastery of grade level standards in grades 3-5.
-School administration will emphasize the importance of reading nightly with students for 30 minutes each night. Communicated through Facebook, school email, and parental involvement night.
-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 2022/23 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 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science achievement continues to be an area of consistency 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. Learning gains in reading for grades 4-5 are improving as well. Most importantly, we have not been identified as been a school in need of improvement for a particular sub group, especially SWD students.

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

For Science, Meadow Park has had a consistent school wide plan. We provide a fifth grade science boot camp for every fifth grader prior to being assessed in the spring. Students participate in a science journal

writing activity daily after given a science question of the day on the morning news. Our Math scores have improved each year as we have a school wide math plan that includes school wide math expectation for grades 3-5. We also implemented supplemental math software programs called Reflex Math and Dreambox Math.

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

We will implement to the new state math standards using Reveal Math and follow the district pacing and instructional guides for math instruction and assessments. For Science, we will continue to implement our school wide science plan to ensure state standards are taught and assessed. In reading, teachers will implement state ELA standards using Benchmark with fidelity. Students will participate in district benchmark ELA assessments to determine progress of ELA standards. School administration will collaborate with grade level teams on a regular basis to monitor student progress in ELA and the review district and school based ELA data. Instruction or acceleration will be implemented as needed. For L25 students in grades K and 1, SIPS phonics program will be implemented with fidelity. For grades 2-5 L25 students will be provided with 30 minutes of additional reading instruction using LLI reading intervention program. The district reading plan will be followed as well with fidelity to track and monitor students who are reading deficient.

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.

Teachers will be provided district and school based pd focused on Reveal Math and infusing the new state math standards in grades K-5. Teachers will also have pd for Dreambox Math used a student work station during the 60 minute math block.

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

School administration and Lead teacher will meet with grade level teams on a weekly/monthly basis to collaboratively plan and ensure ELA and Math standards are being implemented with fidelity. Furthermore, collaborative planning will include the analysis of student assessment data in ELA/Math and to ensure instructional corrections are made as a result of progress monitoring of student data in ELA and Math.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The importance of collaborative planning, professional learning communities, and the use of the B.E.S.T. Standards for ELA are critical when planning for instruction in ELA. In addition, it is imperative that teachers follow the district's pacing and instructional guides for Tier I planning and instruction as well as the B.E.S.T. Proficiency Scales. 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 Benchmark for Tier I instruction. Another instructional focus area will be providing common and formative assessments and using the continuous improvement model to reteach, assess, and evaluate student progress. In addition to collaborative planning and the use of the B.E.S.T. ELA standards, writing instruction will be another targeted area for improvement in order to increase ELA achievement for 4th and 5th grades. Next, teachers in grades 3-5 will implement ReadingPlus as a supplemental reading program during work stations. Overall, Meadow Park has seen a three year decline in reading proficiency for students in grades 3-5. In order to reach our goal of being an A school, we will need to increase our reading proficiency to a minimum of 62% proficiency. Data Review: The overall reading proficiency rate in ELA for 2021/22 was 53% which is a decrease of 4 % points from the previous year (57%).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%).
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By the end of the 2022/23 school year, ELA proficiency for third, fourth and fifth grades will increase by 10 points from a 53% proficiency (2021/22 FSA) to 63% proficiency as determined by the spring 2023 FAST Assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	School leadership team will meet on a weekly and monthly basis to review Benchmark ELA pacing and instruction as well as reviewing district and FAST ELA assessments. The school based leadership team and Literacy Leadership Team will make recommendations for acceleration or remediation as a result of student data pulled from district and state assessments. Grade level teams will meet monthly to review district/state ELA assessment results to plan and alter teaching and instruction to increase student proficiency in the area of reading. School Administration will review weekly lesson plans and conduct daily walk throughs to ensure standards based ELA instruction is occurring. The Leadership team will create a student data base to monitor and tract student progress and determine the amount of growth students will need to make to meet proficiency.
Person responsible for	Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)

monitoring outcome:	
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	-Infuse Reading Plus as a supplemental ELA resource to accelerate ELA proficiency for grades 3-5. -Implement Reading Recovery for struggling first grade students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Reading Plus is a supplemental ELA based computer based reading program that has a "strong" ESSA rating. Reading Recovery is an intensive remedial reading program for struggling first grade readers. Reading Recovery has a "strong" ESSA rating.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Develop a guided reading expectation guide for all teachers in grades K-5. Create Guided Reading plan where Reading Recovery teachers and Lead Teacher push into classrooms to model effective guided reading.

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

Utilizing Title I funds and ESSER funds to purchase additional guided reading books for grades K-5. Utilize title funds to purchase Reading Plus, Squiggle Park, and Reading Eggs as a supplemental reading program and for additional support during intervention block and reading centers.

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

Meet with teachers on a weekly/monthly basis to collaborate and ensure the ELA B.E.S.T. Standards are being taught and implemented with fidelity. Monitor student data (district and state) during progress windows to determine if a change in course is necessary or a "reset" is necessary. Implement collaborative planning on a regular basis to ensure common planning is occurring.

Person Responsible   Meridith Meerman (meridith.meerman@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Deliver daily Reading Recovery instruction and Literacy Lessons to our targeted deficient first grade and ESE readers.

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

Recruit and retain new teachers who are reading endorsed and experienced in the delivery of ELA instruction using B.E.S.T. standards.

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

Primary teachers will participate in Key Literacy PD to enhance their skills in delivering reading instruction and guided reading.

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

Teachers will participate in the Division of Learning professional development in ELA instruction.

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

The school leadership team will monitor teacher lesson plans submitted to Canvas to ensure Benchmark is being used with fidelity and that instructional pacing is appropriate.

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

Ensuring guided reading is being implemented with fidelity in grade 4 and 5 and our self-contained EBD classrooms.

| **Person Responsible** | Meridith Meerman (meridith.meerman@yourcharlotteschools.net) |

Utilize Benchmark to teach the FL B.E.S.T. ELA Standards for grades K-5. Teachers will also utilize the district pacing and curriculum guides to drive ELA instruction.

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

Participate in district level assessments to monitor and accelerate instruction.

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

Review and evaluate teacher lesson plans weekly to ensure ELA standards are being taught with rigor and with fidelity.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The area of focus is to enhance the growth and proficiency of reading for students who fall into the lowest 25 percentile according to 2021/22 FSA scores and EOY STAR/iReady 2021/22 data. This sub group has fallen short of the district and state percentile rankings throughout the past several years for learning gains 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 2021/22 FSA data and BOY 2022/23 ELA data, L25 ELA students will be placed in a Tier II/III reading group. Tier II students will be monitored bi-weekly and Tier III students weekly. 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 2022/23 school year, teachers will be provided with professional development in the area of "guided reading" by our reading recovery specialists. 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. The school leadership team will ensure grade level teams are following the CCPS Progress Monitoring guide for ELA.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By the end of the 2022/23 school year, 55% of students in the Lowest 25 percent will demonstrate a learning gain on ELA based on 2022/23 FAST Assessment(s) and STAR. By the end of the 2022/23 school year, 62% of students in grades 4-5 will demonstrate a learning gain in reading as determined on the 2022/23 FAST assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	-The Literacy Leadership Team will review progress monitoring data 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 throughout 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	Lauren Elek (lauren.elek@yourcharlotteschools.net)

for monitoring outcome:	
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	-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 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 -Utilize Fountas and Pinnell's LLI to accelerate the reading levels of Tier II/III students -Implement SIPPS phonics instruction for grades K-2.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Based on past L25 ELA FSA data, our data continues to be below district and state averages. 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. Reading Recovery accelerates the reading of struggling first graders and lowers the retention rates in third grade. Reading Recovery has a "strong" ESSA rating. SIPPS® (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words) has a strong ESSA rating.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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)

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	Meridith Meerman (meridith.meerman@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)

Review monthly progress monitoring 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. Furthermore, utilize FAST progress monitoring data to determine the acceleration of students receiving additional reading instruction by reading endorsed teachers.

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

Teach the FL B.E.S.T. ELA Standards using Benchmark consistently and with fidelity.

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

Infuse the guided reading plan for grades K-5.

Person Responsible Meridith Meerman (meridith.meerman@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	An area of concern at Meadow Park, is the achievement levels of our Lowest 25% in Math. Based on 2021/2022 FSA data, 57% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. Based on 2020/21 FSA data, 60% of students in Lowest 25% made a learning gain in math. 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. Last, our ESE students in grades 2-5 were 25% proficient.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By the end of the 2022/23 school year, ESE students will increase their proficiency in the area of math by 5 points from 49% proficiency (2021/22 FSA Math Assessment) to 54% proficiency based on the spring 2022/23 FAST Math Assessment. By the end of the 2022/23 school year, ESE students will increase their proficiency in the area of reading by 17 points from 25% proficiency (2021/22 FSA ELA Assessment) to 42% proficiency based on the spring 2022/23 FAST ELA Assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	-The school based leadership team will review L25 progress monitoring data on a monthly basis with math intervention and ESE 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. (Reveal Math, Number Talk, Reflex Math, and DreamBox). -School administration will conduct weekly classroom walk throughs during the 90 minute reading block to ensure the B.E.S.T. ELA standards are being taught using Benchmark and that guided reading is occurring with fidelity. -Reading Plus, Benchmark, and FAST assessments will be reviewed with teachers on a monthly basis during monthly data chats. -Self Contained ESE Teachers will be a part of grade level data chats and professional learning communities to ensure grade level ELA and Math standards are being taught.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	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 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 Literacy Lessons (Reading Recovery for ESE Students) -Utilize Fountas and Pinnell's LLI to accelerate the reading levels of Tier II/III students -Implement SIPPS phonics instruction for grades K-2. -Utilize Dreambox Math to accelerate math proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Although the majority of our ESE students who are in self-contained ESE classes are below level in reading and math, they still needs to be exposed to grade level ELA/Math B.E.S.T. standards. Furthermore, self-contained ESE students will not only be exposed to grade level ELA standards but will be provided with additional reading services for acceleration and remediation.

Fountas and Pinnell's LLI is an evidence based guided reading program for Tier II/III students. It also has a "strong" ESSA rating.

Reading Recovery/Literacy Lessons accelerates the reading of struggling first graders/ ESE students and lowers the retention rates in third grade. Reading Recovery/Literacy Lessons has a "strong" ESSA rating.

SIPPS® (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words) has a strong ESSA rating.

Dreambox Learning has a "strong" ESSA rating. |

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

ESE self-contained ESE teacher will participate in grade level data chats and professional learning communities.

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

School administration will monitor teacher lesson plans to ensure ELA and Math pacing is appropriate and that ESE classrooms are implementing Benchmark and Reveal.

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

Meadow Park will collaborate with the Florida inclusion Network to develop an effective "BPIE" in the goal of increasing ELA achievement for students with disabilities.

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

ESE students in grades 3-5 will be provided with an additional 30 minutes of core math instruction with a certified ESE teacher. They will also be "front loaded" with important core math content before they taught the material in their homeroom class. The ESE teacher will

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

ESE students in grades 3-5 will be provided with additional 30 minutes of reading instruction. The ESE teacher will utilize LLI guided reading materials and SIPPS to accelerate reading proficiency.

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

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The importance of collaborative planning, professional learning communities, and the use of the B.E.S.T Standards for Math are critical when planning for instruction in Math. In addition, it is imperative that teachers follow the district's pacing and instructional guides 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 and Reveal Math to effectively plan and pace for Tier I instruction. Another instructional focus area will be providing common and formative assessments and using the continuous improvement model to reteach, assess, and evaluate student progress. Next, teachers in grades K-5 will implement Dreambox and MyMath Academy as a supplemental math program during work stations. Overall, Meadow Park has seen an increase in math proficiency for students in grades 3-5. In order to continue reach our goal of being an A school, we will need to continue to increase math proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By the end of the 2022/23 school year, Math proficiency for third, fourth and fifth grades will increase by 5 percentage points from 65% proficiency (2021/22 FSA Assessment) to 70% proficiency as determined by the spring 2023 FAST Assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	School leadership team will meet on a weekly and monthly basis to review and evaluate math pacing and instruction as well as reviewing district and FAST Math assessments. The school based leadership team and will make recommendations for acceleration or remediation as a result of student data pulled from district and state assessments. Grade level teams will meet monthly to review district/state Math assessment results to plan and alter teaching and instruction to increase student proficiency in the area of math. School Administration will review weekly lesson plans and conduct daily walk throughs to ensure standards based Math instruction is occurring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matt Loge (matthew.loge@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	Teachers will implement Dreambox Math and MyMath Academy to accelerate math proficiency for students in grades K-5.

implemented for this Area of Focus.	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Dreambox Math and My Math Academy have a "strong" ESSA rating.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Implement B.E.S.T. Math Standards using Reveal Math and utilizing the District pacing and curriculum guide for math.

Person Responsible Meridith Meerman (meridith.meerman@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Utilize supplemental math materials such as Reflex Math, My Math Academy, and Dreambox Math to enhance student mastery of the B.E.S.T. Math standards.

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

Participate in district wide math assessments (Reveal Math) and utilize the data to alter or accelerate math instruction and learning. Furthermore, participate in MOY data chats with grade levels teams to determine a course of action for the second half of the school year (MOY Reset).

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

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

NA

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 school culture and environment.

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.