

Charlotte County Public Schools

Myakka River Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 22 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 22 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 24 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Myakka River Elementary School

12650 WILLMINGTON BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33981

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| 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. 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.</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. 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> |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Myakka has an active School Advisory Council that meets regularly throughout the school year. The scheduled meetings are posted in the student planners as well as on a document that is sent home at the start of the school year. The School Advisory Council reviews progress on the SIP at every meeting. On the April 11, 2023 SAC meeting, the members were able to provide feedback and input on the development of our 23.24 SIP.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in the following ways:

SIP will be reviewed and discussed at school partnership performance committee meetings

SIP will be reviewed and discussed at all SAC meetings

SIP will be reviewed and discussed during data days and adjustments will be made if necessary

| Demographic Data | |
|--|--|
| 2023-24 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 |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 20% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 99% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Identification | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 15 | 18 | 25 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 2 | 12 | 22 | 21 | 17 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 1 | 23 | 23 | 27 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 1 | 23 | 23 | 27 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

| Accountability Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 54 | | | 61 | | | 63 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 71 | | | 65 | | | 48 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 62 | | | 60 | | | 28 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 60 | | | 67 | | | 59 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | 63 | | | 60 | | | 48 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 50 | | | 48 | | | 39 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 38 | | | 63 | | | 56 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | | | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | | | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | | | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | | | | |
| ELP Progress | | | | | | | | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 57 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 398 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 40 | Yes | 2 | |
| ELL | 32 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | | | |
| HSP | 76 | | | |
| MUL | 54 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | | | |
| FRL | 53 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 54 | 71 | 62 | 60 | 63 | 50 | 38 | | | | | |
| SWD | 31 | 58 | 38 | 46 | 56 | 25 | 25 | | | | | |
| ELL | 18 | | | 45 | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 60 | | 50 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 90 | | 69 | 82 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 38 | | | 69 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 71 | 61 | 59 | 60 | 45 | 38 | | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 70 | 68 | 51 | 57 | 39 | 42 | | | | | |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 61 | 65 | 60 | 67 | 60 | 48 | 63 | | | | | |
| SWD | 33 | 33 | | 53 | 50 | | 42 | | | | | |
| ELL | 64 | | | 69 | | | 50 | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 67 | 83 | | 62 | 71 | | 56 | | | | | |
| MUL | 67 | | | 67 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 59 | 55 | 68 | 56 | 57 | 64 | | | | | |
| FRL | 59 | 70 | 77 | 64 | 56 | 47 | 55 | | | | | |

| 2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 63 | 48 | 28 | 59 | 48 | 39 | 56 | | | | | |
| SWD | 42 | 30 | 19 | 35 | 33 | 29 | 29 | | | | | |
| ELL | 54 | | | 62 | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 66 | 60 | | 50 | 57 | | 40 | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 47 | 27 | 61 | 46 | 37 | 57 | | | | | |
| FRL | 60 | 42 | 17 | 52 | 38 | 23 | 57 | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was our 5th grade science proficiency. The score was at 45% proficient. The contributing factor to last year's low performance is the lack of alignment with instruction and standards.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was our Math proficiency. We went from 60% to 56% proficient. The contributing factor to this decline was the implementation of the new BEST math standards and the new Reveal curriculum.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was fifth grade science. The state is at 51% and we were at 45%. Although we were below the state average, we did increase our percentage last year from 38% to 45%. The contributing factor to last year's low performance is the lack of alignment with instruction and standards.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component that showed most improvement was our ELA proficiency. We went from 54% to 58% proficient. The new actions we took as a school include the following:

1. We provided more professional development opportunities for ELA than other content areas.
2. We had a Focused Intervention Team (FIT) that provided consistent tier 2 evidence based interventions to our tier 3 students in all grade levels. These same students receive tier 3 interventions at a different time from a reading endorsed teacher. This ensures tier 3 students receive both tier 2 and tier 3 supports daily.
3. Literacy Leadership Team monitored assessment data monthly and made school wide instructional decisions and support for teachers based on the data

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

96 students missed 10% or more of the 22.23 school year.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Science Achievement
2. Math Achievement
3. SWD
4. ELL
5. Attendance

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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

Our current proficiency rate for ELA, Math, and Science is a 53%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase our proficiency for ELA, Math, and Science.

We will increase our ELA proficiency from 57% to 62%.

We will increase our Math proficiency from 56% to 62%.

We will increase our Science proficiency from 45% to 54%.

Monitoring:

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

Impact Monitoring: 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.

Implementation Monitoring: We will review collaborative planning notes, lesson plans, and walk-through observation notes to ensure that instruction is aligned to the standards. We will provide feedback to the staff through weekly memos.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will increase the overall proficiency of students through collaborative planning and professional development related to their knowledge of the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of teacher efficacy during collaborative planning 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 1.34 yield.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will ensure instruction is aligned to standards through standards mapping during collaborative planning with instructional coaching.

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

By When: Weekly on Thursdays for the 23.24 school year

Focused Intervention Teacher will attend collaborative planning to ensure L25 receive grade level standards related instruction at the appropriate rigor.

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

By When: Weekly on Thursdays for the 23.24 school year

Administration will evaluate teacher instruction and student tasks for alignment to standards through regular walkthroughs.

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

By When: Once a week for the 23.24 year

Admin will monitor the implementation of rigorous and standards aligned tasks by asking students about their progress toward their individual academic goals through "greeting and goals" morning walks.

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

By When: Once a week for the 23.24 year

Admin will visit classrooms after each progress monitoring to celebrate the success of students that made a learning gain.

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

By When: 3 times a year, the week following the progress monitoring window closing

Admin will view lesson plans and preview proficiency scales before weekly walkthroughs to monitor for pacing and rigor of content.

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

By When: Every Monday for the 23.24 school year

Teachers will participate in collaborative conversations related to standards and determine school wide trends and needs during professional learning, as a staff, and in content specific PLCs

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

By When: Weekly on Wednesday for the 23.24 school year

Teachers will participate in professional learning with our C&Is to increase understanding of the implementation of our adopted curriculum

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

By When: Initial training to take place in the first quarter then ongoing by-monthly

Students will use science notebooks to document nature of science and vocabulary.

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

By When: One investigation/experiment documented per topic

lead teacher and literacy coach will support science instruction through the STEM rotation and standards aligned assessment driven lesson planning

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

By When: One investigation/experiment documented per topic

All students will participate in the school-wide science fair

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

By When: October 27, 2023

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELL and SWD ESSA sub-groups are an area of focus because they did not reach 41% proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal for ELL is:

to increase the number of students proficient in ELA from 33% to 42%.

to increase the number of students proficient in Math from 50% to 54%.

to increase the number of students proficient in Science from 0% to 42%.

Our goal for SWD is:

to increase the number of students proficient in ELA from 37% to 42%

to increase the number of students proficient in Math from 36% to 42%

to increase the number of students proficient in Science from 27% to 42%

Monitoring:

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

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

Implementation monitoring: We will review collaborative planning notes, lesson plans, and walk-through observation notes to ensure that instruction is aligned to the standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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).

According to Hattie, the effect size for RtI is 1.29. SWD students will participate in intensive small group instruction to practice skills and strategies more frequently resulting in increased application of skills with confidence and automaticity.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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/SWD support through PD.

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

By When: August back to school PD and before each progress monitoring window

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

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

By When: August back to school PD and before each progress monitoring window

Confirm that all accommodations are being used in all areas of learning and assessment. If accommodations are not meeting the needs of the students, advocate and change accommodations to meet the needs of the students.

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

By When: August back to school PD and before each progress monitoring window

Leverage Focused Intervention Team (FIT) support services through scheduling and utilization of allocations.

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

By When: August 2023

Confirm that lesson plans include instruction of grade level standards for SWD/ELL through accommodations and differentiation.

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

By When: Weekly on Mondays for the 23.24 school year

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our Early Warning System Indicators showed 96 students with 10% or more missed days of school.

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 23.24 school year our students that missed 10% of school or more will be reduced to 65 or less (10%).

Monitoring:

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

Our student attendance is monitored through FOCUS attendance reports at the school, class, and individual level. School wide data is monitored weekly by our social worker and shared with admin. Classroom data is tracked daily by classroom teacher. Individual data is tracked by the social worker as needed for students with an attendance intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Grace Tollefson (grace.tollefson@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

PBIS and check and connect

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS and check and connect support positive relationship and habits of students. Attendance is a critical first step to academic achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Administration will monitor school-wide attendance and individual attendance and share out at core team meetings

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

By When: two times a month on Mondays for the 23.24 school year

Social worker will create attendance punch cards for students needing intervention. The card will be used for rewards at the school store

Person Responsible: Alyssa Ponder (alyssa.ponder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Fridays weekly for the 23.24 school year

Teachers will track attendance using the attendance target poster. Classes will work to fill their attendance letters for rewards

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

By When: Daily before 9:00 for the 23.24 school year

Students will earn morning manatee tickets for being on time every day. These tickets will be used to earn privileges.

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

By When: Fridays weekly for the 23.24 school year

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Schoolwide Improvement funds are allocated to schools annually as a per pupil allocation based on Survey 3 FTE data. Supplemental federal funds are allocated to schools as requested by school leadership and based on need. Schools complete the Federal Programs Consultation Survey to request funds needed to support their school improvement areas of focus. The federal programs team reviews each request and approves on an individual basis giving priority to schools designated as CSI, TSI, and ATSI respectively. Our funds will be used to purchase evidence based intervention materials.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

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

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 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 Measurable Outcomes**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****Monitoring****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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

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. §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?

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

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****Title I Requirements****Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP, budget, and SWP is shared with our SAC, staff, and students. The information is presented during the SAC meeting, during staff meetings, and during student conferring. This information is also posted to our website and sent to parents electronically. Our webpage, <https://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/mre>, includes the school's SIP. It is available online in multiple languages and available in print upon request. Updates are shared with our SAC and PTO three times a year after progress monitoring.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

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 create 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. 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. Our webpage, <https://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/mre>, includes the school's family engagement plan.

We also share our family engagement plan in print and electronically through remind and email. The engagement plan is created with our PFEP team. It is shared with our SAC and PTO. We also call community members that are part of our school partnerships to individually communicate events and partnership opportunities.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We will focus on enriching and accelerating curriculum as needed during our What I Need time. This time allows teachers to individualize instruction based on data.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Our plan was created after participating in BSI facilitated SIP training. Our school has partnerships with the Rotary, Boys and Girls club, YMCA, Gulf Cove United Methodist Church, and Back Pack Program to support us in implementing our activities.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

School-based mental health professionals are here to support the social, emotional, and behavioral needs of students and families in Charlotte County Public Schools consistent with state Resiliency Standards as well as required Health & Educational mandates.

In addition to supporting health and resiliency education for all students, school based mental health staff members are available to provide services to students that are requiring a higher level of support. Parent contact will be made if school based mental health services are recommended. Parents have the right to consent to or decline any of the following services.

Individual Counseling
Group Counseling
Ongoing Mentoring

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

We will follow the district strategic career planning guidelines. By year 3 of implementation our elementary school students will be able to implement the plan to expose them to other career and technical education programs available to them when they continue to middle school and then high school.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We use the multi tiered systems of support in our district. Tier 1 students are successful with the instruction and strategies that are in place for all students in the classroom. When students begin to struggle or fall behind, they are then provided with an evidenced based intervention provided in a small group setting at least 3 times a week. If these students are still falling short of the goals, we provide a more intense evidenced based intervention one on one. Meetings may be held with the parents and teachers involved to share progress on interventions. Progress is shared frequently and interventions will be updated if the student is not finding success. If the student still continues to struggle, the parent or teacher support team may request further evaluation to take place.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional learning is delivered in a variety of ways. New teachers complete the New Educator Training requirements including Harry Wong classroom management and Educational Impact courses focused on the marzano elements. All teachers meet for weekly PLCs related to grade level standards and instructional alignment. Teachers attend data days to reflect on data by domain and student sub groups and then create action plans related to the SIP goals. Finally all staff attends district and school required Professional Learning days related to our curriculum and state expectations.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Our school has strong relationships with our community preschool programs and our county VPK and ESE PreK programs. We offer a kindergarten sneak peek that allows families and future kinder students to visit for half a day. During this time expectations are shared and questions are answered by admin and teachers. In addition, our kindergarten lead teacher meets with our VPK and ESE PreK teachers on a regular basis to discuss individual student needs as well as program needs. Our community PreK programs are in contact with our admin and we provide suggestions for their program based on the data we receive from our incoming kindergarten assessments.