

Charlotte County Public Schools

Charlotte Harbor School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	10
Title I Requirements	11
Budget to Support Goals	12

Charlotte Harbor School

22450 HANCOCK AVE, Port Charlotte, FL 33980

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/chc>

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)
Combination School PK-12	No	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	43%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

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.

We strive to educate students and to assist them in realizing their full potential as responsible, productive, contributing members of society by providing an educational environment in which students are challenged, excellence is expected and differences are valued.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Reaching our potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Bennett, Herb	Principal
Arritt, Jon	Assistant Principal
Wood, Sandra	Other
Simmons, Penny	Other

Duties

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

All staff collaborate for student success. Leadership meetings are held to discuss behavioral plans, evaluate data and analyze school security plans. Best practices for Positive behavior support for both staff and students are deliberated. The roles of members also include discussing proactive testing administration, reviewing engaging curriculum's used and revising appropriate teaching strategies that are being implemented.

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	4	5	2	1	3	6	8	7	10	7	5	2	5	65
One or more suspensions	5	1	1	0	1	4	7	6	9	6	2	1	1	44
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	9	10	10	3	1	0	51
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	7	10	14	12	12	10	2	2	1	76

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	1	1	1	0	2	5	8	7	10	7	2	1	1	46

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	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	7	12
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected

Thursday 8/30/2018

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	5	1	2	8	4	6	3	4	4	7	4	5	4	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	2	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	1	5	1	5	6	6	6	3	1	4	1	41
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	2	4	5	5	3	2	1	4	1	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	2	3	4	6	5	0	2	4	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	2	5	4	5	5	5	4	2	1	5	0	38

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	1	0	2	2	6	6	5	5	1	1	5	1	35

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?

The math learning gains was the lowest, no it has increased but not at the same rate as the ELA learning gains in ELA or math. our ELA learning gains increased from 23% to 46% Our math learning gains went from 8% to 34% (ELA was selected because the trend population was very similar).

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The greatest decline would be the grade 4 FSA and FSAA ELA and Math scores.

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

Our Math FSA scores compared to the state had the largest gap.

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

Our ELA learning gains increased from 23% to 46% yes, this is a trend with the insertion of the FSAA data because students are being assessed with differentiated instruction and evaluated on access points appropriate for all levels of learners.

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

Our one or more suspensions went from 19 students to 9 students showing a decrease of over 47% indicating they are spending more time in the classroom. Some of the actions taken that led to the decrease of number of suspensions were an increase in Behavior plans, staff training on Crisis Prevention, training on verbal de-escalation skills, and an addition to Social/Emotional curriculum.

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	0%	73%	60%	0%	73%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	53%	57%	0%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	0%	52%	0%	0%	49%
Math Achievement	0%	54%	61%	0%	48%	56%
Math Learning Gains	0%	45%	58%	0%	33%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	0%	52%	0%	0%	48%
Science Achievement	0%	83%	57%	0%	61%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	65%	77%	0%	71%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	4 (5)	5 (1)	2 (2)	1 (8)	3 (4)	6 (6)	8 (3)	7 (4)	10 (4)	7 (7)	5 (4)	2 (5)	5 (4)	65 (57)
One or more suspensions	5 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (1)	1 (0)	4 (2)	7 (1)	6 (1)	9 (0)	6 (1)	2 (1)	1 (2)	1 (0)	44 (9)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	12 (0)	9 (0)	10 (0)	10 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	51 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)	10 (0)	14 (0)	12 (0)	12 (0)	10 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	76 (0)

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
03	2018	0%	63%	-63%	57%	-57%
	2017	0%	66%	-66%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
	2017	0%	59%	-59%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018	0%	56%	-56%	55%	-55%
	2017	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2018	0%	48%	-48%	52%	-52%
	2017	0%	52%	-52%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2018	0%	51%	-51%	51%	-51%
	2017	0%	45%	-45%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
	2017	0%	52%	-52%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2017	0%	52%	-52%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2017	0%	54%	-54%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	0%	69%	-69%	62%	-62%
	2017	0%	71%	-71%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
	2017	0%	69%	-69%	64%	-64%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018	0%	62%	-62%	61%	-61%
	2017	0%	56%	-56%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2018	0%	46%	-46%	52%	-52%
	2017	0%	51%	-51%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2018	0%	64%	-64%	54%	-54%
	2017	0%	57%	-57%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2018	0%	45%	-45%	45%	-45%
	2017	0%	49%	-49%	46%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	0%	63%	-63%	55%	-55%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	0%	53%	-53%	50%	-50%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	69%	-69%	65%	-65%
2017	0%	72%	-72%	63%	-63%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	78%	-78%	71%	-71%
2017	0%	75%	-75%	69%	-69%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	75%	-75%	68%	-68%
2017	0%	72%	-72%	67%	-67%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	72%	-72%	62%	-62%
2017	0%	59%	-59%	60%	-60%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
2017	0%	58%	-58%	53%	-53%
Compare		0%			

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
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

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	We would like to show learning gains in Math by 12.5%
Rationale	By achieving the 7.5% gains in ELA and 12.5% gains in math we will reach a 50% score leading to a "commendable" title. This is a total of 20% increase.
Intended Outcome	Targeting these areas in hopes to increase ELA and Math gains by 20% would reflect an increase in both learning gains, student engagement and reaching our 50% increase to be considered a "commendable" school.
Point Person	Herb Bennett (herb.bennett@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Action Step

Description	To increase learning gains we will need to make sure that student accommodations are being utilized (found in IEP's). Some accommodations include extended time, one sided materials and questions read out loud to a student.
Person Responsible	Herb Bennett (herb.bennett@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	We will have meetings for teachers to show documentation of proper utilization of accommodations.
Person Responsible	Herb Bennett (herb.bennett@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Activity #2	
Title	We would like to see learning gains in ELA by 7.5%
Rationale	By achieving the 7.5% gain in FSA and FSAA ELA in grades 3-10 and a 12.5% gain in math in the areas of FSA and FSAA grades 3-8 also, an increase in FSAA Algebra/Geometry EOC's . We will reach a 50% score leading to a "commendable" title. This is a total of 20% increase.
Intended Outcome	Targeting these areas in hopes to increase ELA and Math gains by 20% would reflect an increase in both learning gains, student engagement and reaching our 50% increase to be considered a "commendable" school.
Point Person	Herb Bennett (herb.bennett@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	To increase learning gains we will need to make sure that student accommodations are being utilized (found in IEP's). Some accommodations include extended time, highlighted text, one sided material and questions being read out loud to a student.
Person Responsible	Herb Bennett (herb.bennett@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	We will have meetings for teachers to show documentation of proper utilization of accommodations.
Person Responsible	Herb Bennett (herb.bennett@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

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

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

Each student is on an IEP, parents are invited to participate in each one of these meetings, at these meetings goals and objectives are updated and discussed. Also, teachers keep daily journals to inform parents how their child's day went, if needed, phone calls are made. In addition, parents are invited to participate in our School Advisory Committee, in which they are able to hear about what is going on in our school and give their feedback. Parents have access to FOCUS and our school based website for additional information. Also, Newsletters are sent home quarterly.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

There is a full-time psychologist at our school and a behavior counselor that comes twice a week. Our SRO discusses safety with individual classrooms. We also have implemented a new curriculum called The Zones of Regulation, this is designed to foster self-regulation and emotional control with our students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

As students transition into our school we are prepared as a team to place them in an environment that will be appropriate academically, functionally, and behaviorally. These needs are decided in a meeting by an IEP team. At these meetings we discuss proper placement, necessary accommodations, academic learning goals, and behavior plans geared towards students transitioning to a least restrictive environment.

Students that have shown consistent improvement in academics and a reduction of problem behaviors, can begin transition visits to their alternative school site. After a specific number of successful visits, the staffing specialist and IEP team will meet again to approve placement. Once students have made the final transition, our transitional aide begins a monitoring process to follow-up on the students' success.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The strategies used to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers are:

Charlotte County Public Schools Job Board, PLC's, DPP's (Teacher Evaluations) CEU's, Staff Incentives through PBIS, SAC, Generation Ready, CASE/CAPE, and In/Out of county workshops.

The people responsible for recruiting and retaining highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers are: Herb Bennett, Sandra Wood, Jon Arritt, Laura Allen, Kristy Johnson, PBIS Team, and Outside Agencies (CEU's).

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Some students that are on a transitional IEP participate in job training that is either held on or off campus. These student clean, recycle, sort, do laundry and complete other life skills. The students that go off campus go to either Publix, Good Will or Florida SouthWestern State College. They set tables, clean and recycle. Also, we have several students that participate in the real world program, this is held at the Charlotte Tech Center, here students learn different life skills and discuss their IEP's. Grades 6-12 have career prep access courses. Twelfth graders that have earned all of their credits have courses such as transitioning, preparation for adult living and health and safety.

Part V: Budget

Total:

\$305.00