

Charlotte County Public Schools

Meadow Park 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	17
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Meadow Park Elementary School

3131 LAKE VIEW BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33948

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/mpe>

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together We Succeed Through Leadership.

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
Elek, Lauren	Principal	<p>To develop a school-wide instructional plan where all student' academic needs are met and develop a continuous improvement system to ensure frequent monitoring and evaluation of student data and effective institutional practice.</p> <p>Develop a master schedule to ensure instructional time is valued</p> <p>Observe and evaluate teacher practice</p> <p>Create systems and procedures to ensure the continuous improvement model in embedded into the culture of the school.</p> <p>Develop and create a school community which fosters and encourages student and faculty growth.</p> <p>Chair reading/literacy committee which will review school-wide reading/ literacy trends, ELA data, and make adjustments school-wide as necessary.</p>
Probst, John	Assistant Principal	
Meerman, Meredith	Instructional Coach	
Bishop, Bo	School Counselor	
Wolfe, Jill	Teacher, ESE	

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.

The school improvement team includes admin, teachers, and core team members. We draft a school improvement plan, and then share it with PTO and SAC members for feedback. After discussing the plan at a SAC meeting, we finalize it together.

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))

We will review the school improvement plan at our core team meetings, grade level collaborative planning meetings, team leader meetings, PPC meetings, and PTO/SAC meetings. As the year progresses, we will monitor school-wide as well as grade level data regularly and make any changes or adjustments as needed.

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	37%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
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: B 2018-19: B 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	1	30	28	25	12	27	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	1	2	4	0	0	0	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	3	9	7	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	7	18	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	18	15	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	12	19	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	11	5	10	6	6	0	0	0	39

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	1	3	14	21	0	0	0	39

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	0	5	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	10
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	2	33	33	28	30	32	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	2	2	8	4	11	9	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	15	24	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	12	19	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	22	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	26	9	7	3	19	0	0	0	65

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	1	1	2	4	21	29	0	0	0	58

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	2	33	33	28	30	32	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	2	2	8	4	11	9	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	15	24	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	12	19	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	22	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	26	9	7	3	19	0	0	0	65

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	1	1	2	4	21	29	0	0	0	58

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	53			57			59		
ELA Learning Gains	57			52			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47			41			41		
Math Achievement*	65			63			60		
Math Learning Gains	63			59			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57			60			52		
Science Achievement*	65			64			63		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	85						57		

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	492
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
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	43			
ELL	69			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	64			
HSP	59			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	58			

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	53	57	47	65	63	57	65					85
SWD	25	35	41	49	60	65	29					
ELL	44	63		63	88							85
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57	56		60	83							
HSP	47	49	45	60	67	64	58					83
MUL	63	65		76	75		75					
PAC												
WHT	54	58	47	65	58	50	68					
FRL	52	51	49	59	60	51	60					80

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	57	52	41	63	59	60	64					
SWD	32	45	46	37	57	57	33					
ELL	57			79								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55	55		65	45		50					
HSP	59	53		61	53		65					
MUL	68			58								
PAC												
WHT	56	55	50	64	64	60	67					
FRL	54	47	44	60	57	57	60					

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	59	52	41	60	58	52	63					57
SWD	37	35	33	41	46	50	45					
ELL	47	50		67	90							57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45	35		41	59		46					
HSP	61	57	50	62	62	53	52					62
MUL	69	79		65	58		69					
PAC												
WHT	60	49	35	61	57	52	67					
FRL	50	47	39	54	53	46	55					

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.

Our biggest area for growth is in English Language Arts. Our weakest grade level in terms of ELA proficiency was 3rd grade. Our teachers struggled with staying on pace with the district curriculum maps. One of our teachers was out on long term leave and there was a long-term substitute in that classroom for almost 8 weeks. Many of our L25 students are still missing key foundational phonics and vocabulary skills.

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

ELA proficiency showed the greatest decline from the previous year. Our students are lacking the foundational phonics and vocabulary skills to read fluently and comprehend grade level text.

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.

Our 3rd grade reading proficiency was 4% lower than the state average. 4th and 5th grade was only 1% lower. Our students are lacking the foundational phonics and vocabulary skills to read fluently and comprehend grade level text.

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

Our 5th grade reading data increased by 4%. Our 3rd grade math increased by 4%. Our 5th grade team departmentalized to focus on reading. During collaborative planning, we used the universal backwards design to make sure we are teaching the key vocabulary and components that students will be assessed on. Our 3rd grade team became more comfortable with the components of the McGraw Hill Reveal series and utilized more small group resources.

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

ELA proficiency, Learning Gains and proficiency for students with disabilities

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

Phonics

Writing

Reading Proficiency

Academic interventions for L25 specifically students with disabilities

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

We had 476 behavior referrals during the 22-23 school year. Most of these referrals were in the areas of classroom disruption and physical aggression. On our end of year teacher surveys, teachers had a recurring concern in the area of culture and student behavior.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to decrease our number of office discipline referrals in class disruption and aggression by 10% each. We had 142 referrals for class disruption so we'd like to decrease that to no more than 128. We had 71 referrals for aggression so we'd like to decrease that to no more than 64.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor office discipline referrals during our weekly core team meetings and monthly child talk meetings. Our MTSS team will implement tier 2 and tier 3 interventions to help our students with the greatest need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Probst (john.probst@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.)

Our school implements a school-wide PBIS program. Students are rewarded for positive behavior and celebrated monthly. Our school psychologist, social worker, and counselor facilitate tier 2 and tier 3 behavior interventions. We have over 40 students identified for a Check and Connect intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School climate and culture have a direct effect on classroom instruction and student learning. Student learning is disrupted during behavior incidents, so by targeting these behaviors in a proactive way, we're hoping to increase the amount of time students are on task and engaged in learning.

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.

We will implement tier 2 and tier 3 small group or individual behavior interventions for students identified for additional support.

Person Responsible: John Probst (john.probst@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Students in need of additional support will be identified by the end of the first quarter.

We will implement school-wide character education lessons on our morning announcements, teachers will teach focus words of the month, recognize students of the month for positive behavior, celebrate positive behavior with monthly celebrations, and we will create hallway displays to support these initiatives.

Person Responsible: Meredith Meerman (meridith.meerman@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Lesson plans and celebrations will be planned and communicated to teachers in the month of August.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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 ELA proficiency data has consistently shown a need for improvement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan on increasing our overall reading proficiency by 9%. In 22-23 we were 53% proficient in ELA so we'd like to increase to 62% for 23-24.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor formative assessments using Benchmark unit assessments throughout the year. Teachers will use the training they receive during professional development to align the state rubric to their instruction and district assessment grading. Grade levels will review data during collaborative planning meetings and data days to create action plans targeting areas of need in the area of need. In the area of phonics, teachers will consistently pull reports from Reading Eggs to track student growth in phonics, fluency, and comprehension skills. This data will be reviewed at grade level planning meetings and data days to monitor the effectiveness of our professional development endeavors.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Meridith Meerman (meridith.meerman@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.)

Students in need of support in reading will have access to LLI, SIPPS, and teacher-led small group guided reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These intervention materials and strategies are part of our district comprehensive evidence-based reading plan.

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.

Students identified as having a significant deficiency in reading will be placed in these interventions including our students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: Bo Bishop (bo.bishop@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Students will be identified through IEP meetings and/after the completion of beginning of the year State FAST assessment.

Our lead teacher will create a needs assessment based on teacher input and assist grade levels in creating a professional learning plan that will meet their needs.

Person Responsible: Meredith Meerman (meridith.meerman@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: She will meet with teams to create these professional learning plans in the month of August.

Teachers will participate in professional learning in the area of writing instruction and scoring rubrics.

Person Responsible: Meredith Meerman (meridith.meerman@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Our lead teacher will facilitate these professional learning opportunities beginning in the Fall.

School admin will purchase UFLi materials to supplement our tier 1 phonics instruction.

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

By When: We will purchase these materials as soon as they are approved by the district.

Teachers will participate in professional learning through instructional rounds and attending national conferences.

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

By When: Instructional rounds and conference registrations will be arranged in the Fall.

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.

We used our SIP money to purchase decodable readers for our primary classes, a school-wide license for EDUTyping for our students to increase their typing abilities for the state writing assessment, and we bought 7 new bulletin boards to support our PBIS word of the month initiatives to help our culture and climate goal.

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

Kindergarten: 33% scored below a level 3 on the state reading assessment and their average score on Benchmark assessments was 80%. 26% did not meet EOY expectations on DRA.

1st grade: 30% scored below a level 3 on the state reading assessment and their average score on Benchmark assessments was 69%. 36% did not meet EOY expectations on DRA.

2nd grade: 30% scored below a level 3 on the state reading assessment and their average score on Benchmark assessments was 57%. 40% did not make EOY expectations on DRA.

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

3rd grade: 54% scored below a level 3 on the state reading assessment and their average score on Benchmark assessments was 53%

4th grade: 43% scored below a level 3 on the state reading assessment and their average score on Benchmark assessments was 62%

5th grade: 46% scored below a level 3 on the state reading assessment and their average score on Benchmark assessments was 61%

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

Our K-2 students are showing solid proficiency leaving their grade levels. We plan to maintain greater than 62% proficiency in each grade level.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

We plan to increase our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade ELA proficiency 10% each. This should increase our overall reading proficiency to 62%.

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.

Our 3rd grade students will take the state assessment 3 times a year. Based on the data from these assessments, we will make intervention groups focusing on specific domains of reading. (Phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension) Students will be assessed weekly by their intervention teacher to track their progress through these interventions. If progress isn't made, groups will be changed or new interventions will be introduced. We will also look at Benchmark Unit assessments to be sure students are on track to proficiency by the end of the year.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bishop, Bo, bo.bishop@yourcharlotteschools.net

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?

Our 3rd grade students in need of intervention will be receiving intensive interventions daily using LLI and SIPPS. Both programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based, align with the district's CERP, and align the the B.E.S.T. standards. Students will be assessed weekly to be sure the interventions are effective.

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?

Students will be given a core phonics survey as well as an LLI placement test before being placed in groups to be sure that we are targeting the needed domain. We chose LLI and SIPPS because both of

these programs are evidence-based and have been vetted by our school board as approved resources. We have used these resources in the past and they have shown to be effective resources for students in need of remediation.

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
Our literacy leadership team will review 3rd grade data at our monthly meetings.	Elek, Lauren, lauren.elek@yourcharlotteschools.net
Our literacy coaches will push in to our 3rd grade classrooms to provide coaching in the area of guided reading.	Meerman, Meredith, meredith.meerman@yourcharlotteschools.net
Our intervention teachers will monitor the fidelity of the interventions, assess students weekly, and make changes to the child's intervention plan as needed.	Wolfe, Jill, jill.wolfe@yourcharlotteschools.net
Our lead teacher and Benchmark coaches will provide professional development to our teachers in the areas of phonics and guided reading to improve their tier I ELA instruction.	Meerman, Meredith, meredith.meerman@yourcharlotteschools.net

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.

Our school improvement plan will be reviewed with team leads, PPC, PTO, and SAC during our monthly meetings. During these discussions, we will review our most recent academic as well as behavior data and discuss the progress of our action steps. During these meetings, we can provide printed copies in another language for families that need it. Our plan is also available on the school and district webpage that can be translated into multiple languages.

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))

Our parent and family engagement team meets quarterly to discuss needs and create action plans for family engagement. We survey our families frequently to find out how we can better meet their needs. We hold monthly school activities as well as monthly SAC/PTO meetings to get family input. We also hold bi annual student-led conference events for families to come in and meet with their child and his/her teacher to discuss their progress.

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)

To target our reading proficiency area of focus, we will only be using state approved curriculum and following the district curriculum maps and pacing guides. Our teachers will only be using evidence-based supplemental materials for enrichment and intervention purposes. Our master schedule was created to maximize the amount of instructional learning time, and staff will be proactive in addressing behavior or cultural concerns in order to decrease instructional interruptions as discussed in our positive culture area of focus.

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 with the help of Ashley Monier, our coordinator of state and federal programs to identify areas where federal funds can support our action steps. We collaborate with community organizations like Boys and Girls Club, Big Brothers Big Sisters, Girls on the Run, Charlotte Behavioral Health Center, and the Charlotte County Sheriff's Office to support the needs of our students and families.

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))

Our school counselor, school psychologist, and school social worker collaborate with our classroom teachers to identify students in need of mental health support. We hold bi monthly core team meetings to discuss student needs and create action plans to target those needs in the areas of attendance, behavior, mental health, and academics.

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))

The director of career and technical education has a 3 year plan for ensuring student success after graduation beginning at the elementary level.

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).

Our MTSS team meets regularly to discuss students in need of extra support in the area of behavior. We implement interventions for those students and track their progress. Our school-wide PBIS plan has strategies for targeting tier 2 and tier 3 students.

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))

Teachers participate in weekly team meetings as well as bi monthly collaborative planning meetings and quarterly data chats to analyze data and create action plans to target areas of need. Teachers and paraprofessionals will receive monthly professional learning opportunities to strengthen their instructional strategies. Our lead teacher will facilitate monthly meetings with our newly hired teachers to provide them with a mentor and ensure they have the support they need to be successful.

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 pre school students are included in all our school-wide events and activities. We also hold family events in the Spring to educate families on ways to assist their child at home, and ways to help their child be prepared for kindergarten. We offered a 4 week summer camp for preschool children to assist with the transition to kindergarten. We partner with the Campaign for Grade Level Reading to provide students with Kindergarten readiness bags full of books and learning materials for them to use at home. Many of our students are enrolled in Dolly Parton's Imagination Library program to give them access to books to read at home.