

Charlotte County Public Schools

Myakka River Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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: 8/1/2016

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2021-22 Title I School | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 99% |
| 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 (57%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (52%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | ATSI |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 99% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 20% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Tollefson, Grace | Principal | <p>Grace Tollefson 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.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| Magill, Ryane | Assistant Principal | <p>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.</p> |
| Dillmore, Carrie | Other | <p>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 the MTSS coordinator and is an Instructional Coach for all teachers as needed. She is the NET teacher coordinator.</p> |
| Smith, Nicole | Instructional Coach | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/1/2016, Grace Tollefson

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.*

2

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

603

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

7

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

8

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 | 78 | 106 | 112 | 117 | 90 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 605 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 23 | 23 | 27 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |

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 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

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 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 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

Friday 8/19/2022

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 | 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 | |

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 | 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 | |

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 | 54% | 59% | 56% | | | | 63% | 62% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 71% | 60% | 61% | | | | 48% | 57% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 62% | 48% | 52% | | | | 28% | 50% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 60% | 65% | 60% | | | | 59% | 63% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 63% | 61% | 64% | | | | 48% | 54% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | 54% | 55% | | | | 39% | 42% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 38% | 56% | 51% | | | | 56% | 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 | 78% | 69% | 9% | 58% | 20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 57% | -5% | 58% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -78% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 56% | -3% | 56% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |

| 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 | 65% | 70% | -5% | 62% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 60% | -2% | 64% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -65% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 56% | -4% | 60% | -8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -58% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 52% | 4% | 53% | 3% |
| 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 | 31 | 58 | 38 | 46 | 56 | 25 | 25 | | | | |
| ELL | 18 | | | 45 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 60 | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 90 | | 69 | 82 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 38 | | | 69 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 71 | 61 | 59 | 60 | 45 | 38 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 70 | 68 | 51 | 57 | 39 | 42 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |
| FRL | 60 | 42 | 17 | 52 | 38 | 23 | 57 | | | | |

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) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 57 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 398 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 40 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 32 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 47 |
| 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 | 76 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 56 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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?

Overall achievement (proficiency) decrease for reading, math, and science. In reading and math we earned a B. In science we earned a D. The fifth grade students were our raise grade level for reading and their reading ability impacted their overall science proficiency. We increased in learning gains for math and reading overall and for bottom quartile. Our reading gains and bottom quartile gains earned an A. Our math gains were an A and our bottom quartile gains were a C. Our students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup earned a 40%. Our ELL subgroup earned a 32%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Science scores were at 38% proficient, SWD 40% and our ELL subgroups 32%, and overall proficiency for math and reading decreased. These are all our areas needing 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?

Science was not tracked consistently through formative assessment. Our teachers did not participate in district science collaboration opportunities. SWD data was not tracked separately for progress monitoring. We used our PD opportunities to focus on interventions and were learning a new core curriculum. ELL resources are limited and groups were not held to target their individual needs. 20% of our students were absent 10% or more from school. The data reflected that the students who missed the most days scored lower than peers that attended school regularly.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Learning gains for ELA and L25 ELA and learning gains for Math and L25 Math showed the most improvement.

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

In ELA we used a consistent intervention system for our bottom quartile. We identified tier 2 and 3 students correctly and were consistent with intervention implementation and data tracking. We provided professional development to aid in the implementation of the new benchmark reading curriculum. Fourth grade was consistent with data tracking, pacing, and implementing the "do the math" intervention.

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

To increase achievement in all areas we will monitor attendance and we have changed our data tracking to include classroom, grade level, and school to create overall awareness of the importance of attendance. We are communicating attendance with our parents through the newsletter and in the office. To accelerate learning in science, math, and reading we will communicate the updated expectations for our school, follow the county pacing, and complete formative assessments. Data based, instructional decisions will be made through collaboration at data days and collaborative planning.

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.

The impact of our professional development for our core reading, math, and science will be monitored through walk through data collection, formative assessments, and collaborative planning notes. By the end of the 22/23 school year, teachers will work collaboratively to create teacher efficacy* in the areas related to the comprehensive evidence based reading plan (6+4+T1+T2+T3), Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning standards, BEST standards and teaching strategies (Marzano Elements).

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

In addition, we will monitor the impact of our core curriculum and communicate results in our core team meetings, collaborative planning, and data days. We will decide on instructional decisions and school wide goals through quarterly reflective meetings with teacher teams.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. 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.

Our sub category of students with disabilities scored at 40%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goals is to move from 40% to 45%.

Monitoring:

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

This area will be monitored using district formative assessments. SWD percent proficient will be compared to the percent proficient of student without disabilities using google sheets in core.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)

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

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: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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

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.

Create and communicate expectations for our ESE push in support through PD. This action step aligns to indicator 25 of our BPIE priority indicators (There are a variety of service delivery models in place, across all grade levels, to provide instruction and related services for SWDs in gen.ed.) It also aligns with our BPIE priority indicator 26 (All paraprofessionals receive professional development on ways to support SWDs in gen.ed.)

Person Responsible

Carrie Dillmore (carrie.dillmore@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Communicate expectations for creating and implementing quality IEPs and goal setting. This action step aligns to indicator 25 of our BPIE priority indicators (There are a variety of service delivery models in place, across all grade levels, to provide instruction and related services for SWDs in gen.ed.) It also

aligns with our BPIE priority indicator 26 (All paraprofessionals receive professional development on ways to support SWDs in gen.ed.)

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

Confirm that all accommodations are being used in all areas of learning and assessing as appropriate. If accommodations are not meeting the needs of the student, advocate and collect data to change accommodations. This action step aligns to indicator 25 of our BPIE priority indicators (There are a variety of service delivery models in place, across all grade levels, to provide instruction and related services for SWDs in gen.ed.) It also aligns to BPIE priority indicator 18 (Specials, electives, and technical education teachers have regular opportunities to consult with special education teachers)

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

Leverage push in support services through scheduling and utilization of allocations. This action step aligns to indicator 25 of our BPIE priority indicators (There are a variety of service delivery models in place, across all grade levels, to provide instruction and related services for SWDs in gen.ed.)

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

Confirm that ESE lesson plans include instruction of grade level standards. This action step aligns to indicator 25 of our BPIE priority indicators (There are a variety of service delivery models in place, across all grade levels, to provide instruction and related services for SWDs in gen.ed.)

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

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our sub category score for ELL students was 32%.

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

Our goal is to move from 32% to 41%.

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

This area will be monitored using district assessments. ELL percent proficient will be compared to the percent proficient of non-ELL students using google sheets at monthly core team meeting.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)

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

Provide intensive small-group reading interventions, extensive and varied vocabulary instruction (using visual guides and organizers to scaffold learning), peer assisted learning, and frequent opportunities to use multiple modalities.

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

According to "What Works Clearinghouse" (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide/6>), a major theme is the importance of intensive, interactive English language development instruction for all English learners. This instruction needs to focus on developing academic language (i.e., the decontextualized language of the schools, the language of academic discourse, of texts, and of formal argument).

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.

Create and communicate expectations for our ELL support through PD.

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

Communicate expectations for creating and implementing quality LEP plans and goal setting.

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

Confirm that all accommodations are being used in all areas of learning and assessing as appropriate. If accommodations are not meeting the needs of the student, advocate and collect data to change accommodations.

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

Leverage FIT support services through scheduling and utilization of allocations.

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

Confirm that lesson plans include accommodations and strategies for ELL instruction of grade level standards.

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

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Instructional practice related to standards-aligned instruction is an area of focus because it will increase achievement (proficiency) in ELA, Math, and Science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our current school grade is a 57% (B), this included learning gains. For the 22/23 school year, our school grade will be determined using achievement only. Using achievement only our school grade for 21/22 would have been a 51% (C). Our goal is to move from a 51% to a 62% in ELA, Math, and Science achievement.

Monitoring:

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

We will use Benchmark unit assessments, Reveal unit assessments, and Elevate science unit quizzes to formatively assess. We will use DRA and Mondo assessments in K-2. We will progress monitor using FAST assessments in K-5.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)

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

Teachers will increase the overall proficiency of students through the use leadership notebooks to set individual student expectations related to grade level standards and proficiency scales and provide formative evaluation to monitor student progress toward those goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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

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.

Set up leadership notebooks and schedule dates to communicate progress with stakeholders. Goals are established using BEST standards and proficiency scales.

Person Responsible

Ryane Magill (ryane.magill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Group students by instructional needs to provide practice in skill based groups using evidence based resources (Benchmark, Reveal, Heggerty, Do the Math, LLI, SIPPS).

Person Responsible

Ryane Magill (ryane.magill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Assess formatively and use progress monitoring, adjust groups based on data, and provide feedback to students toward goals.

Person Responsible

Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teachers will attend professional development related to the SIP goals. This PD will include: collaborative planning, analyzing formative and progress monitoring assessments during data days, reviewing curriculum pacing guides and assessment calendars, determining instructional strategies and tools that will be used for delivery of instruction.

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

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our science proficiency score was 38%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to move from 38% to 62% proficient in science.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor science formative assessments through the Elevate Science curriculum.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryane Magill (ryane.magill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

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:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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

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.

Core team will monitor the use of the district pacing for science instruction and the completion of formative assessments.

Person Responsible

Ryane Magill (ryane.magill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Specials teachers will map out lessons to incorporate STEM based books and vocabulary and relate them to their specials content area through the use of the CCPS pacing guides.

Person Responsible

Ryane Magill (ryane.magill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Students will complete science inquiry lessons and document learning in their science notebook. During instruction teachers will have a specific focus on vocabulary.

Person Responsible

Ryane Magill (ryane.magill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

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

K-2 grade levels do not qualify for raise designation.

63% of last year's kindergarten students left kindergarten at the proficient level. By the end of the year, 66-67% of our first grade students will be at the proficient level. 53% of last year's first grade students left first grade at the proficient level. By the end of the year, 56-57% of our second graders will be at the proficient level. 71% of last year's second graders left second grade at the proficient level. By the end of the year, 74-75% of our third graders will be at the proficient level.

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

5th Grade was designated as our RAISE grade level.

49% of our 5th grade students were proficient on the 21.22 FSA in reading. 51% of our 5th grade students were not proficient.

61% of our 4th grade students were proficient on the 21.22 FSA in reading.

53% of our 3rd grade students were proficient on the 21.22 FSA in reading.

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)

K-2 grade levels do not qualify for raise designation.

Kindergarten ELA proficiency will increase from 63% to 66-67%

1st grade ELA proficiency will increase from 63% to 66-67% (last year's kindergarten students were at 63%)

2nd grade ELA proficiency will increase from 53% to 56-57% (last year's 1st grade students were at 53%)

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

3rd grade and 4th grade do not qualify for raise designation.

3rd grade ELA proficiency will increase from 71% to 74-75% (last year's 2nd grade students were at 71%)

4th grade ELA proficiency will increase from 53% to 56-57% (last year's 3rd grade students were at 53%)

5th grade ELA proficiency will increase from 49% to 64-65%. (last year's 4th grade students were at 61%)

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.

We will use Benchmark Advanced assessment, LLI assessments, DIBELS, DRA, and FAST assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Tollefson, Grace, grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net

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?

Teacher will use Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) with tier 2 and tier 3 students. This intervention is rated strong. LLI is part of our CERP. LLI does align to B.E.S.T.

Teachers will clearly articulate and explicitly teach the learning intention along with success criteria throughout their ELA block using grade level B.E.S.T. proficiency scales and FAST test blueprint.

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?

Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) will address the comprehension and fluency deficits. LLI is proven strong.

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:

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 |
|---|---|
| Literacy Leadership Team will meet monthly to review ELA progress across all grade levels with a specific focus on our 5th grade scores. | Tollefson, Grace, grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net |
| Reading coach and lead teacher will provide coaching for literacy by gathering data after formative assessments and analyzing results to determine student needs. They will collaborate with teacher and communicate ideas for instructional support through the coaching cycle. | Dillmore, Carrie, carrie.dillmore@yourcharlotteschools.net |
| Core team will review data for attendance, reading formative assessments, FAST and reading interventions for tier 2 and 3 students. We will pull out SWD and ELL subgroups when analyzing data. | Smith, Nicole, nicole.smith@yourcharlotteschools.net |
| Teachers will work collaboratively to create teacher efficacy in the areas related to the comprehensive evidence based reading plan (6+4+T1+T2+T3), BEST standards and teaching strategies (Marzano Elements). Teachers will attend sessions related to reading foundations in K-2 and effective planning for all tiers of instruction in 3-5. | Dillmore, Carrie, carrie.dillmore@yourcharlotteschools.net |

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.

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 will 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 parent-teacher conferences. Throughout the school year we have family involvement activities such as, student award 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 school culture and environment.

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.