

Charlotte County Public Schools

Charlotte High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Charlotte High School

1250 COOPER ST, Punta Gorda, FL 33950

<http://chs.yourcharlotteschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Angie Taillon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (54%) 2014-15: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Charlotte High School

1250 COOPER ST, Punta Gorda, FL 33950

<http://chs.yourcharlotteschools.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	52%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Be a Learner, Be a Leader, Be a Tarpon!

Be a Learner.....ever-learning, every moment of time, everywhere, and under all circumstances. We learn by working hard at school and always doing our best.

Be a Leader....Lead your own life, be a strong example for others, live by principles, and be an influence for good. Self-leadership is doing the right thing even when no one is looking.

Be a Tarpon.....Promote our Tarpon culture, reinforce our Tarpon fundamentals, and model high expectations for ourselves and others.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is "Tarpons have MOJO" which stands for: Motivation for Success, Ownership of our actions, Journeys through education, and Optimism for the future. We continue to promote a culture where Tarpons do their best, do what is right and treat others the way they wish to be treated.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Corsaletti, Cathy	Principal	Working together to create an engaging school climate that accelerates student learning is common sense. Each person in the partnership takes an active role and is accountable for effectively completing their individual responsibilities. The principal, along with each AP, oversees a specific department and works together to ensure that standards based instruction is taking place. With each working with a different department we are able to collaborate on strengths and weaknesses within our school. The assistant principal for curriculum work closely with guidance to develop a master schedule designed to give students the most flexibility for success. The assistant principal for discipline works closely with the deans to ensure student safety, monitors early warning signals for those students in need, and implements the MTSS process. The assistant principal for activities works with his team to provide students opportunities to build relationships with others and participate in our positive school culture outside of the classroom. The Principal works with all APs to promote our common vision.
Brown, Nick	Assistant Principal	
Damico, Jeff	Assistant Principal	
Pyle, Kathryn	Assistant Principal	
Tenney, Andrew	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	456	475	486	477	1894	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	117	118	126	459	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	87	104	67	362	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	204	201	199	714	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	125	147	91	480	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	81	79	81	290

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	0	12

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

92

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/12/2019

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	48	57	60	56	221
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	51	46	25	159
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	98	112	31	350
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	126	85	37	368

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	78	69	22	245

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	48	57	60	56	221
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	51	46	25	159
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	98	112	31	350
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	126	85	37	368

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	78	69	22	245

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	51%	62%	56%	52%	61%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	54%	51%	52%	55%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	45%	42%	37%	50%	41%
Math Achievement	54%	64%	51%	54%	64%	49%
Math Learning Gains	51%	56%	48%	41%	51%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	52%	45%	34%	47%	39%
Science Achievement	71%	72%	68%	82%	78%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	80%	73%	73%	78%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	456 (0)	475 (0)	486 (0)	477 (0)	1894 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	98 (48)	117 (57)	118 (60)	126 (56)	459 (221)
One or more suspensions	104 (37)	87 (51)	104 (46)	67 (25)	362 (159)
Course failure in ELA or Math	110 (109)	204 (98)	201 (112)	199 (31)	714 (350)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	117 (120)	125 (126)	147 (85)	91 (37)	480 (368)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	50%	53%	-3%	55%	-5%
	2018	46%	53%	-7%	53%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	49%	52%	-3%	53%	-4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	54%	53%	1%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	71%	1%	67%	5%
2018	69%	69%	0%	65%	4%
Compare		3%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	76%	5%	70%	11%
2018	74%	75%	-1%	68%	6%
Compare		7%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	45%	64%	-19%	61%	-16%
2018	60%	72%	-12%	62%	-2%
Compare		-15%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	62%	-2%	57%	3%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	55%	60%	-5%	56%	-1%
Compare		5%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	35	26	31	52	58	48	61		89	19
ELL	35	50	37	31			33	45		77	30
ASN	64	46									
BLK	42	37	16	43	46	50	60	59		96	30
HSP	47	50	41	55	57	65	62	75		91	47
MUL	42	41	43	46	37		71	65		94	47
WHT	53	52	37	57	53	55	74	82		95	52
FRL	45	45	34	49	49	58	65	72		93	42
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	21	42	32	33	35	33	46	55		79	24
ELL	33	31	18								
ASN	83	69		67	45		80				
BLK	32	40	32	44	35		56	61		86	32
HSP	40	43	41	52	46	53	48	68		87	44
MUL	53	56		60	63		80	67		79	55
WHT	53	52	42	55	42	38	72	78		92	52
FRL	44	48	43	48	42	42	60	66		84	37
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
SWD	24	36	29	24	29	28		45		68	26
ELL	14	33		40	43					75	
ASN	75	73		75	57					91	80
BLK	37	46	37	29	28	24	42	67		84	29
HSP	48	48	33	47	38	41	90	67		88	20
MUL	45	40	20	37	29	8		77		90	37
WHT	54	53	39	58	42	37	84	74		89	54
FRL	39	43	32	47	37	32	72	68		83	38

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	24
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	611
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	55
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 lowest performance was ELA 10th Grade proficiency. As a cohort, the students did increase by 3%, however the overall proficiency declined. We believe one of the main factors is the students endurance to complete the test. Many are not motivated and give up right away.

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

Our Algebra 1 EOC data showed the lowest performance with a drop of 15%. Two years ago we changed our sequence and we were unable to maintain proficiency as intended.

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 greatest gap when compared to the state is the ELA lowest 25%. We believe one of the main factors is the students endurance to complete the test. Many are not motivated and give up right away.

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

The most improved area was the math lowest 25%. We provided afterschool math tutoring, an Algebra 1 Boot Camp prior to the EOC, and supplemented instruction with Algebra Nation and Khan Academy.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Student attendance and student failures in math and English are a concern and also those students exhibiting three or more warning signs.

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

1. Increase learning gains in ELA and the ELA lowest 25%.
2. Increase Algebra 1 EOC proficiency
3. Increase College and Career Readiness.
4. Increase Proficiency of our ELL students.
5. Increase proficiency in ELA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%
Rationale	Overall, we had a decrease from 41% to 35% in our lowest 25%. The focus will be to increase the gains of our lowest 25%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The intended outcome is to increase our ELA Lowest 25% learning gains by 7%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will continue our school-wide literacy-based initiative (year 3 of implementation).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Literacy is so fundamental to learning that its importance cannot be overstated. It is the essential foundation of education. The ultimate aim of the literacy initiative is to equip our students with the necessary literacy skills that they need to take control of their destiny and fulfill their potential.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue with PD for staff and students. 2. Continue with cross-curricular Literacy Council meetings. 3. Monitor school-wide rubric and data for school-wide Literacy Initiative 4. Increase the frequency of literacy skills in day to day activities 5. Introduce effective strategies to get students to think about, write about, read about, and talk about the content. 6. Block the lowest ELA students with a shared reading and English teacher for additional support. 7. Teachers will be provided data days to review the progress monitoring data from Airways.. 8. Provide a list to all teachers of the lowest 25% in ELA. 9. The reading and strategies support teacher will conference with each student regarding scores, progress monitoring, and what is needed for student to make the learning gain. 10. Use of XL as a supplement for support classes.
Person Responsible	Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#2	
Title	Increase English Language Learners (ELL) Subgroup Proficiency
Rationale	To be in compliance with state requirement of 41% or higher.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELL subgroup by 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Working with content area teachers to support ELL students and introduction of interactive technology.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students will be more supported during learning and will have a better understanding of the ELL student and their strengths and weaknesses.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Word lists of EOC courses will be supplied to teachers and students. 2. Use of tablets, chromebooks, and apps with lessons and quizzes for student use 3. Student conferencing regarding student performance and goal setting to meet proficiency. 4. ELL teacher will visit each department to discuss ELL students and strategies for success. 5. Use of Google translation 6. Use of USA Prep English grade 10 to increase vocabulary and track success.
Person Responsible	Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3	
Title	Algebra 1 EOC Proficiency
Rationale	The Algebra 1 EOC was our greatest decline dropping 15%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase our Algebra 1 EOC proficiency by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Some evidence-based strategies will include a holistic approach to instruction as well as using web-based interactive software.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Blending the traditional strategies with the current to focus on the teacher/student relationship in tandem with the use of technology to enhance student achievement.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use of software including Algebra Nation and Khan Academy (including using results from district-wide PSAT testing to generate individual learning plans). 2. Algebra 1 PLC's and teacher data days. 3. Algebra 1 boot camp/ after school tutoring. 4. Algebra 1 teacher/student conferencing (including student data review and goal setting). 5. Use of school-wide literacy initiative in all math classes. 6. Intentional scheduling of students in Algebra classes. 7. Teachers will receive information on their current students and the lowest 25% students.
Person Responsible	Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#4

Title	Increase % of students in the College and Career/Acceleration Category
Rationale	Over the last few years many seniors have graduation without earning a college and career acceleration point.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

For the 2020-21 school year, we are planning to increase 5% from our most current data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jeff Damico (jeff.damico@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy

To build a master schedule that supports this goal to include several options for students to earn an acceleration point.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

By building a master schedule it will increase our options for student placement and include more opportunities for students to earn college and career points.

Action Step**Description**

1. All 9th graders will be placed in a course/section where they will have the opportunity to earn an acceleration point.
2. 11th/12th grader transcript review to see if acceleration point was earned / if not attempt to place in classes for opportunity to gain acceleration point.
3. Additional AP and AICE course offerings.
4. Additional teacher with qualifying industry certification course.
5. Monitor student certifications earned by teacher/course.
6. Addition of 4 new industry certifications classes.

Person Responsible

Jeff Damico (jeff.damico@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%				\$3,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	510-Supplies	0031 - Charlotte High School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,500.00
			<i>Notes: Supplies for Literacy Initiative</i>			
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	0031 - Charlotte High School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Data Days and Teacher Training</i>			

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase English Language Learners (ELL) Subgroup Proficiency				\$400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	510-Supplies	0031 - Charlotte High School	School Improvement Funds		\$400.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Algebra 1 EOC Proficiency				\$2,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	510-Supplies	0031 - Charlotte High School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Supplies for Algebra Boot Camp</i>			
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	0031 - Charlotte High School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,500.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase % of students in the College and Career/Acceleration Category				\$800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	0031 - Charlotte High School	School Improvement Funds		\$800.00
			<i>Notes: Data days, teacher certification training</i>			
Total:						\$7,700.00