Charlotte Harbor School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Charlotte Harbor School

22450 HANCOCK AVE, Port Charlotte, FL 33980

http://yourcharlotteschools.net/chc

Demographics

Principal: Herb Bennett

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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

Charlotte Harbor School

22450 HANCOCK AVE, Port Charlotte, FL 33980

http://yourcharletteschools.net/chc

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)
Combination School PK-12	No	%

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

School Grades History

Year

Grade

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.

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bennett, Herb	Principal	Conducts classroom walk-throughs and teacher and para observations, and manages student, parent and staff needs and concerns.
Arritt, Jon	Assistant Principal	Conducts classroom walk-throughs and teacher and para observations, and manages student, parent and staff needs and concerns.
Wood, Sandra	Other	Oversees student behaviors, is responsible for writing student behavior plans, assists in staff assistance calls, and trains staff for CBI training.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	2	7	14	10	7	6	9	9	22	11	8	5	27	137
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	6	7	3	3	3	2	9	7	4	2	7	54
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	10	6	2	1	1	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	6	3	1	0	1	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	8

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	2	4	3	3	3	10	6	3	1	1	37

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	2	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
23

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/23/2019

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

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

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	0%	65%	61%	0%	70%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	49%	59%	0%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	46%	54%	0%	0%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	60%	62%	0%	50%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	43%	59%	0%	51%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	35%	52%	0%	0%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	60%	56%	0%	67%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	75%	78%	0%	67%	75%

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	
Number of students enrolled	2 (0)	7 (0)	14 (0)	10 (0)	7 (0)	6 (0)	9 (0)	9 (0)	22 (0)	11 (0)	8 (0)	5 (0)	27 (0)	137 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (4)	1 (5)	6 (2)	7 (1)	3 (3)	3 (6)	3 (8)	2 (7)	9 (10)	7 (7)	4 (5)	2 (2)	7 (5)	54 (65)
One or more suspensions	0 (5)	3 (1)	3 (1)	4 (0)	3 (1)	3 (4)	3 (7)	3 (6)	10 (9)	6 (6)	2 (2)	1 (1)	1 (1)	42 (44)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (3)	2 (3)	1 (12)	0 (9)	6 (10)	3 (10)	1 (3)	0 (1)	1 (0)	16 (51)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (6)	3 (7)	1 (10)	2 (14)	1 (12)	0 (12)	1 (10)	0 (2)	0 (2)	0 (1)	8 (76)

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
03	2019	0%	69%	-69%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	49%	-49%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	46%	-46%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	55%	56%	-1%	56%	-1%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		55%				
Cohort Comparison		55%				
09	2019	0%	53%	-53%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	0%	70%	-70%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	69%	-69%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	60%	-60%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	56%	-56%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	46%	-46%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	0%	64%	-64%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	80%	47%	33%	46%	34%
	2018	0%	45%	-45%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		80%				
Cohort Comparison		80%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	55%	-55%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	69%	-69%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	78%	-78%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	78%	-78%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	76%	-76%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	75%	-75%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	72%	-72%	62%	-62%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%

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	35	58		39	49		17	29		45	
BLK	50			42	40						
WHT	33	53		44	56		20	40			
FRL	36	68		44	58		17				
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	264
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	41
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	45
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.

Math and ELA both had declining scores in grade 5. The contributing factors were not utilizing proper testing accommodations, poor attendance rate, negative behaviors causing a decrease in classroom seat time, and distractions causing a decrease in student engagement.

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

Math and ELA both had declining scores in grade 5. The contributing factors were not utilizing proper testing accommodations, poor attendance rate, negative behaviors causing a decrease in classroom seat time, and distractions causing a decrease in student engagement.

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 greatest gaps were with our 5th graders in both ELA and math. Our average in ELA was 0 percent passing leaving us at a 55% deficit compared to the state average. In math we were at a 61% deficit. Implementation of proper accommodations was not utilized.

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

Our greatest gains were in math going from 34% to 71%, we also had ELA gains from 46% to 73%. The actions taken to achieve these gains were utilization of IEP accommodations, an increase in professional development, and a continued re-direction of academic rigor.

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

After reviewing data we have found that 6 students were enrolled in grade 5, 3 showed an attendance rate below 90%, that was half of the students, also 3 showed 1 or more suspensions which was again half of the students enrolled. With this information and the poor test scores in this grade level, we

have determined that our concerns should focus on attendance and negative behavior causing suspensions.

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

1. Improved attendance
2. decrease in negative behavior/Suspensions
3. decrease in ISS
4. Increase in parent involvement
5. Increase in PBIS

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase in 6th grade ELA
Rationale	Targeting this area will put all grade levels to a commendable status.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase in 6th grade ELA scores by 55%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Herb Bennett (herb.bennett@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring for math and ELA will be scheduled through Airways twice per semester.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale behind the stategies listed is that we can show progress monitoring from Iready data and Airways progress monitoring. iReady and Airways programs both conduct their own research and have provided correlational evidence linking success on progress monitoring assessments to achievement on statewide standardized assessments. Evidence Level 3.
Action Step	
Description	1. Iready data will be collected by teachers daily. 2. Progress reports are updated every 9 weeks and are reviewed by administration and school liaison. 3. Academic student shortfalls based on data will be reviewed in MTSS meetings held by Mr. Arritt. 4. Implementation of IEP accommodations will be implemented by teachers and monitored by the school liaison quarterly. 5.Teachers will meet with students bi-weekly to review state assessment results. 6. Students will analyze their scores, then set a goal of improving a minimum of one level. 7. Teachers will check in with students to help track progress toward meeting their goal.
Person Responsible	Herb Bennett (herb.bennett@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#2	
Title	Increase in 6th grade math scores
Rationale	Targeting this area will put all grade levels to a commendable status.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase in math scores by 61%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Herb Bennett (herb.bennett@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring for math and ELA will be scheduled through Airways twice per semester.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale behind the strategies listed is that we can show progress monitoring from IReady data and Airways progress monitoring. iReady and Airways programs both conduct their own research and have provided correlational evidence linking success on progress monitoring assessments to achievement on statewide standardized assessments. Evidence Level 3.

Action Step	
Description	1. Airways data will be collected by teachers daily. 2. Progress reports are updated every 9 weeks and are reviewed by administration and school liaison. 3. Academic student shortfalls based on data will be reviewed in MTSS meetings held by Mr. Arritt. 4. Implementation of IEP accommodations will be implemented by teachers and monitored by the school liaison quarterly. 5. Teachers will meet with students bi-weekly to review state assessment results. 6. Students will analyze their scores, then set a goal of improving a minimum of one level. 7. Teachers will check in with students to help track progress toward meeting their goal.
Person Responsible	Herb Bennett (herb.bennett@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).

We will address the improvement priorities by adding an additional behavior specialist, using PBIS to increase student attendance, and utilizing proper accommodations along with behavior plans.

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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).

We are allocated a stipend for test coordinators, county PD's days, and the allotment for Airways training/testing.

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

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Increase in 6th grade ELA**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Increase in 6th grade math scores**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**