Charlotte County Public Schools

Punta Gorda Middle School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Punta Gorda Middle School

1001 EDUCATION AVE, Punta Gorda, FL 33950

http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/pgms

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	79%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	B	B	C	C*

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/9/2018.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Punta Gorda Middle School Mission Statement:

Relentlessly pursuing academic and personal growth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Punta Gorda Middle School Vision Statement

We exist to prepare students academically and socially for the rigor of high school/college/career and to develop admirable citizens in our community.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title
Dionisio, Tina	Principal
Nicklas, Scott	Assistant Principal
McIntosh, Daniel	Assistant Principal
Davey, Mike	Assistant Principal

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Principal, Tina Dionisio, establishes clearly defined roles and expectations for the PGMS leadership team and leads the school overall. For 2018-2019, PGMS has moved away from the middle school model and each assistant principal has been assigned specific leadership duties (see below). Mrs. Dionisio communicates the school's vision and mission to all stakeholders. She functions as the school's primary spokesperson. She establishes expectations which are rigorous, clearly defined, and measurable. She models open communication and speaks frankly about both success and failure. Mrs. Dionisio's leadership fosters a highly collaborative atmosphere where the sharing of ideas is encouraged. She personally evaluates the performance of all first-year teachers as well as several staff members. She is the administrative leader for the math, science and exploratory departments. She is the school's liaison to the District Leadership Team. She oversees the school's budget, makes final decisions regarding facility use, teacher assignments, and the master schedule. Mrs. Dionisio serves as co-chair of the PPC.

Dan McIntosh is assistant principal for curriculum. He is the administrative leader for the ELA, social studies, and technology departments, and he evaluates all teachers in these units. He oversees our ELL and CELLA programs and is responsible for creating the master schedule. He establishes all standardized testing schedules and coordinates the use of computer resources to meet the school's testing needs and protocols. He creates and maintains the school calendar. He oversees progress monitoring and he is the school's technology liaison to the district office. In addition, he trains staff on

a variety of software programs. He monitors the frequency and accuracy of teacher records vis a vis student grades. He is responsible for all communications from school to stakeholders as he controls all PGMS social media accounts (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter).

Dr. Scott Nicklas is assistant principal for facilities and is the administrative leader of our ESE programs, handling discipline for ESE and CD students. He oversees all issues related to school safety, including the scheduling and carrying out of fire, tornado, and code red drills. He supervises and evaluates all custodial staff. He coordinates the scheduling of building maintenance and repairs and ensures proper upkeep of campus grounds. He is the administrative sponsor of our school's PBS (Positive Behavior Support) team. Dr. Nicklas is also the school's Athletic Director. He assigns and oversees all coaches, publishes academic and behavior requirements for all players and monitors compliance with the district guidelines for middle school athletes. Dr. Nicklas also oversees all school activities including clubs & intramurals. He leads our PARAs and he handles bus requests. He supervises administration of our SEA students and handles school inventory including textbooks.

Dr. Michael J. Davey is assistant principal for discipline. He handles all discipline for the school except that for ESE/EBD students. He is in charge of bullying reports and the bully files. He is the PTO liaison and he handles reassignment requests and terminations. He oversees our reading and remedial teachers and handles observations and evaluations for these instructional staff. He leads professional development of teachers, administers surveys of stakeholders, leads instructional technology training and administration. He also coordinates school volunteers.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	50	48	0	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	24	42	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	33	25	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	86	80	0	0	0	0	225

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	43	45	0	0	0	0	122

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	47	24	0	0	0	0	124
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 8/1/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	77	66	0	0	0	0	210
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	27	0	0	0	0	63
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	31	34	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	67	60	0	0	0	0	202

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	44	40	0	0	0	0	129

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	77	66	0	0	0	0	210
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	27	0	0	0	0	63
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	31	34	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	67	60	0	0	0	0	202

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	44	40	0	0	0	0	129

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Math lowest 25% with only 43% of students showing learning gains was our lowest data component. The previous year this subgroup was at 39%. In 2015-2016 the score was 44% showing learning gains. The trend is up and down over three years but still one of our lowest components.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Our greatest decline from the previous year was eighth-grade FCAT Science going from 52 to 48 or -4%.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is eighth-grade math. The state average is 45% and PGMS is at 40% or -5% below the state average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component showing the greatest improvement is seventh-grade ELA at +8%. This is a two-year trend upwards.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

in 2017-18 we paired up ELA and Reading teachers to share the lowest readers in each grade level. This facilitated differentiated instruction and shared planning. Teachers were also able to coordinate lesson plans and reinforce instruction across both subject areas and across classes.

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement	56%	54%	53%	47%	49%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	55%	54%	49%	51%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	48%	47%	39%	41%	45%
Math Achievement	60%	59%	58%	59%	59%	55%
Math Learning Gains	53%	57%	57%	59%	61%	55%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	53%	51%	44%	48%	47%
Science Achievement	49%	57%	52%	47%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	77%	80%	72%	70%	72%	67%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
Attendance below 90 percent	42 (67)	50 (77)	48 (66)	140 (210)
One or more suspensions	19 (1)	24 (35)	42 (27)	85 (63)
Course failure in ELA or Math	17 (32)	33 (31)	25 (34)	75 (97)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	59 (75)	86 (67)	80 (60)	225 (202)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	54%	48%	6%	52%	2%
	2017	54%	52%	2%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	54%	51%	3%	51%	3%
	2017	46%	45%	1%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018	56%	57%	-1%	58%	-2%
	2017	56%	52%	4%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	57%	46%	11%	52%	5%
	2017	54%	51%	3%	51%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	61%	64%	-3%	54%	7%
	2017	61%	57%	4%	53%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2018	40%	45%	-5%	45%	-5%
	2017	43%	49%	-6%	46%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2018	48%	53%	-5%	50%	-2%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	75%	78%	-3%	71%	4%
2017	76%	75%	1%	69%	7%
Compare		-1%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	96%	72%	24%	62%	34%
2017	94%	59%	35%	60%	34%
Compare		2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
2017					

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	26	47	44	29	48	43	22	49	10		
ELL	40	33		33	40						
ASN	80	64		92	80			90			
BLK	41	54	45	45	40	32	33	61	56		
HSP	49	45	32	51	44	36	42	77	48		
MUL	64	63		68	59	50	54	78			
WHT	57	56	51	62	55	45	51	78	53		
FRL	47	52	47	52	51	43	40	73	42		

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	15	37	40	15	29	24	13	47	30		
ELL	38	62		29	57						
ASN	78	73		91	82						
BLK	38	48	40	42	52	38	32	73	45		
HSP	46	50	38	47	47	33	37	73	48		
MUL	61	54		64	57		44		45		
WHT	54	55	51	64	55	40	57	76	63		
FRL	44	51	45	51	50	38	44	66	52		

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title	Math Learning Gains with laser focus on the lowest 25%
Rationale	Our school wide focus is on learning gains for every student. We saw a decrease with our lowest 25% and we are below our district and state average.
Intended Outcome	To have every student earn a year's worth of learning gains in Math.
Point Person	Tina Dionisio (justina.dionisio@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Action Step

Description	Lowest group are in a remediation class for Math: iReady (Computer program); Technology(Chromebooks); Incentives School-wide PLC'S with emphasis on: Formative assessments; Differentiated instruction; Student engagement; Vocabulary Initiative; Critical Concepts Collaborative Plan; Cross-curricular literacy support
Person Responsible	Tina Dionisio (justina.dionisio@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	Instructional Reviews - Learning Walks C and I on campus Participate in DOL on-site school visits/team meetings
Person Responsible	Tina Dionisio (justina.dionisio@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Activity #2	
Title	ELA Learning Gains with laser focus on the lowest 25%
Rationale	Our school wide focus is learning gains for all students. We are right at the district and state level but we know we can and should do better.
Intended Outcome	For all students to earn a year's worth of learning gains in ELA.
Point Person	Daniel McIntosh (daniel.mcintosh@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Action Step	
Description	Reading and ELA class with common teachers for Level One students, not blocks, they share same students; iReady support for remediation & progress monitoring; Technology(computer or chromebook); Incentives; Next lowest readers are in a remediation class School-wide PLC'S with emphasis on: Formative assessments; Differentiated instruction; Student engagement; Vocabulary Initiative; Critical Concepts Collaborative Plan; Cross-curricular literacy support
Person Responsible	Daniel McIntosh (daniel.mcintosh@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Instructional Reviews - Learning Walks C and I on campus Participate in DOL on-site school visits/team meetings
Person Responsible	Tina Dionisio (justina.dionisio@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Activity #3	
Title	ELA Achievement with our SWD students
Rationale	ELA achievement for SWD students for 2017-18 was 29% while the overall school ELA achievement was 58% creating a 32 point gap. We will reduce this gap by at least 10 points this school year.
Intended Outcome	To have reduce the gap by at least 10 points.
Point Person	Scott Nicklas (scott.nicklas@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	ESE Learning Strategies classes; Focus of ESE support will be on ELA/Literacy; SIMS strategies will be used in ELA and Learning Strats classrooms; Identify certain periods of specific teachers and provide them with curricular support; Provide students with extra layer of support in the form of a classroom para; ESE case managers by grade level who check in, monitor, and assist with students in core classes; Check and Connect (mentoring program for select ESE students); School-wide Formative Assessment Emphasis
Person Responsible	Tina Dionisio (justina.dionisio@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Instructional Reviews - Learning Walks C and I on campus Participate in DOL on-site school visits/team meetings Meetings/discussions with ESE Liaison
Person Responsible	Tina Dionisio (justina.dionisio@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Activity #4	
Title	8th Grade FCAT Science
Rationale	We showed our greatest decline in this area, only having 49% proficient and being below our district and state average.
Intended Outcome	To improve our percentage of proficiency by 8% on the 8th grade FCAT Science test. Moving from 49% proficient to 57% proficient.
Point Person	Tina Dionisio (justina.dionisio@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	Review of previous year(s) content; Portfolios; Use of progress monitoring tool(IXL); School wide Formative Assessment emphasis; FCAT Boot Camp
Person Responsible	Tina Dionisio (justina.dionisio@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Instructional Reviews - Learning Walks C and I on campus Participate in DOL on-site school visits/team meetings
Person Responsible	Tina Dionisio (justina.dionisio@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$6,848.00**