

# **Table of Contents**

chool Information eeds Assessment	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	21

# Port Charlotte Middle School

23000 MIDWAY BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33952

http://yourcharlotteschools.net/pcm

Demographics

## **Principal: Matthew Kunder**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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: A (66%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Inf	ormation*
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
	- 1

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo	or more information, <u>click here</u> .

#### 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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

#### 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**

Planning for Improvement	4
chool Information eeds Assessment lanning for Improvement itle I Requirements	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	21

## Port Charlotte Middle School

23000 MIDWAY BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33952

#### http://yourcharlotteschools.net/pcm

**School Demographics** 

School Type and Gr (per MSID F		2018-19 Title I School	l Disadvant	Economically aged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Middle Sch 6-8	nool	Yes		91%
Primary Servic (per MSID F		Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General E	ducation	No		47%
School Grades Histo	ory			
Year Grade	<b>2018-19</b> A	<b>2017-18</b> A	<b>2016-17</b> В	<b>2015-16</b> C
School Board Appro	val			

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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### 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 empower and inspire all students to be critical thinkers by offering innovative and creative opportunities within our diverse community.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Celebrate Success!

#### 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
LeClair, John	Principal	Principal-Co-Chair of PPC, SAC. Responsible for scheduling Professional Development activities requested by the staff. Assist with student discipline interventions and parent conferences. Work withnprogram planners to review grade level data and provide support in the RtI/TST process. Facilitates department PLCs, Oversees instructional intervention programs.
Kunder, Matt	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals-Co-Chair of the SSPPC, member of PTO, Literacy Council. Assist with student discipline interventions and parent conferences. Facilitates the new Teacher PLC and works with teachers on coordinating professional development opportunities. Work with program planners to review grade level data and provide support in the RtI/TST process.
Whisenant, Tara	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals-Co-Chair of the SSPPC, member of PTO, Literacy Council. Assist with student discipline interventions and parent conferences. Facilitates the new Teacher PLC and works with teachers on coordinating professional development opportunities. Work with program planners to review grade level data and provide support in the RtI/TST process.
Hock, Jon	Dean	Dean of Students- Student discipline, bus discipline, bully and harassment coordinator, transportation
arly Warning	Systems	

**Current Year** 

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

In diastan	Grade Level														
Indicator	K 1 2 3 4		5	67		8	9	10	11	12	Total				
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	305	274	289	0	0	0	0	868	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	33	38	0	0	0	0	94	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	43	22	0	0	0	0	81	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	15	14	0	0	0	0	49	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	50	61	0	0	0	0	168	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	9	0	0	0	0	35

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator						Gr	ade	e Le	ve	l				Tetel
Indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
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)

44

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/9/2019

#### **Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator		Grade Level														
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	33	3	0	0	0	0	71		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	37	43	0	0	0	0	113		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	5	0	0	0	0	16		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	18	16	0	0	0	0	88		

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

Indicator						G	rad	e Le	vel					Total
Indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	3	0	0	0	0	17

#### **Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator		Grade Level														
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	33	3	0	0	0	0	71		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	37	43	0	0	0	0	113		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	5	0	0	0	0	16		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	18	16	0	0	0	0	88		

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

Indicator		Grade Level										Total		
Indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	lotal
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	3	0	0	0	0	17

### 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 Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	
ELA Achievement	56%	54%	54%	48%	50%	52%	
ELA Learning Gains	58%	53%	54%	53%	52%	54%	
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	46%	47%	44%	42%	44%	
Math Achievement	71%	63%	58%	62%	59%	56%	
Math Learning Gains	68%	61%	57%	64%	58%	57%	
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	50%	51%	56%	46%	50%	
Science Achievement	64%	59%	51%	53%	54%	50%	
Social Studies Achievement	85%	78%	72%	82%	78%	70%	

Indicator	Grade Lo	Grade Level (prior year reported)						
Indicator	6	7	8	- Total				
Number of students enrolled	305 (0)	274 (0)	289 (0)	868 (0)				
Attendance below 90 percent	23 (35)	33 (33)	38 (3)	94 (71)				
One or more suspensions	16 (33)	43 (37)	22 (43)	81 (113)				
Course failure in ELA or Math	20 (6)	15 (5)	14 (5)	49 (16)				
Level 1 on statewide assessment	57 (54)	50 (18)	61 (16)	168 (88)				
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (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.

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	Year School District		School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
06	2019	50%	49%	1%	54%	-4%
	2018	42%	48%	-6%	52%	-10%
Same Grade C	Same Grade Comparison					
Cohort Com	parison					
07	2019	49%	46%	3%	52%	-3%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	51%	0%
Same Grade C	omparison	-2%				
Cohort Com	parison	7%				
08	2019	60%	56%	4%	56%	4%
	2018	60%	57%	3%	58%	2%
Same Grade C	omparison	0%			· · ·	
Cohort Comparison		9%				

			MATH			
Grade	Year	Year School		School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
06	2019	62%	51%	11%	55%	7%
	2018	45%	46%	-1%	52%	-7%
Same Grade C	Same Grade Comparison					
Cohort Com	parison					
07	2019	71%	62%	9%	54%	17%
	2018	72%	64%	8%	54%	18%
Same Grade C	omparison	-1%				
Cohort Com	parison	26%				
08	2019	58%	47%	11%	46%	12%
	2018	67%	45%	22%	45%	22%
Same Grade C	omparison	-9%				
Cohort Com	-14%					

	SCIENCE											
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison						
08	2019	62%	55%	7%	48%	14%						
	2018	61%	53%	8%	50%	11%						
Same Grade C	1%			·								
Cohort Com												

		BIOLO	GY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	69%	-69%	65%	-65%
	ompare	0%	0070	0070	0070
	inparo		S EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus	State	School Minus
i cai	Ochoon	District	District	Otate	State
2019	84%	78%	6%	71%	13%
2018	86%	78%	8%	71%	15%
Co	ompare	-2%			
	•	HISTO	RY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019			District		State
2013					
2010		ALGEB	RA EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	64%	30%	61%	33%
2018	93%	72%	21%	62%	31%
Co	ompare	1%		•	
		GEOME	TRY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	62%	-62%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
	ompare	0%		00,0	00,0

## Subgroup Data

		2019	SCHOO	OL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	33	57	55	51	66	67	39	69	29		
ELL	50	66	63	66	70	63		78			
ASN	81	80		95	75						
BLK	47	60	67	66	82	86	41	89	64		
HSP	56	60	53	68	70	57	73	79	76		
MUL	59	55		71	69	40	67	90	75		
WHT	56	56	54	72	63	58	64	85	74		
FRL	52	56	51	68	66	65	61	83	67		

		2018	SCHOO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	32	46	41	41	52	62	43	70	40		
ELL	26	53	50	42	64	67					
ASN	100	85		92	92						
BLK	46	57	58	60	64	67	63	94	72		
HSP	59	51	44	64	65	74	50	85	73		
MUL	54	50	71	73	66	71	40	82			
WHT	51	53	47	66	64	64	70	85	78		
FRL	50	53	48	61	65	68	59	83	68		
		2017	SCHOO	OL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	8	35	39	23	46	47	9	57			
ELL	24	44	40	41	56						
ASN	60	64		80	79						
BLK	33	44	36	49	62	53	54	81	54		
HSP	48	56	50	59	61	59	44	76	68		
MUL	41	47	50	41	43	47	55	81			
WHT	52	55	45	68	68	56	57	84	67		
FRL	40	46	37	54	59	54	47	78	62		

### 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)	N/A					
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68					
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO					
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0					
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	85					
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	678					
Total Components for the Federal Index	10					
Percent Tested	100%					
Subgroup Data						

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
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	68
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	83
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	67
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	67
Federal Index - Hispanic Students         Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	67 NO
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students	NO
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students	NO 66
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO 66
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	NO 66
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students	NO 66
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	NO 66 NO
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO 66 NO
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	NO 66 NO
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% Multiracial Students Federal Index - Multiracial Students Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% Pacific Islander Students Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students Subgroup Below 32%	NO 66 NO 0 0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	65
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.

ELA Achievement and Lowest 25th Percentile components were tied for the lowest with 56%. However, we improved by 3% and 5% compared to the prior year. Historically, these are the lowest components for us.

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

Our Math Lowest 25th Percentile component went down from 68% to 61%. We had one less math intensive reading block in 2 grade levels which I feel had an effect of on our lowest performing math group.

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.

We outperformed the state in all components.

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

Our Math Achievement went from 66% to a 71% compared to the prior year. We attribute this to continuing our Fast Pace math classes in 6th and 7th grades.

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

Our Level 1 students on the statewide assessment increased in all grade levels compared to last year. Also, our attendance below 90% increased compared to last year.

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

- 1. Continue our positive trend in ELA Achievement, Learning Gains, and Lowest 25th
- 2. Increase our Math Lowest 25th Percentile by 7%
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focu	IS:
#1	
Title	Increase ELA Achievement
Rationale	ELA continues to show positive trends. We grew 3% in this component compared to the previous year and I believe we can improve another 4% so that 60% of our students are proficient.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase ELA Achievement by 4% so 60% of our students are proficient.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence- based Strategy	ELA teachers will ensure instruction is aligned with the state standards and will also focus on differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all our students. We will continue intensive reading blocks for our struggling readers. Teachers will also chunk standards in order to cover the curriculum. Teachers will begin to use critical concepts. Increase the number of Chromebooks in the classroom to help with progress monitoring and enhance learning.
Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy	Extra time in reading classes has proven to increase reading achievement. Critical concepts will ensure teachers teach standards at the rigor necessary to increase achievement. We will use AirWays to monitor progress.
Action Step	
Description	<ol> <li>Chunk Standards</li> <li>Align instruction to Standards (Critical Concepts)</li> <li>Increase number of Intensive Reading sections (6)</li> <li>Teacher piloting Extreme Reading Program (7th grade reading block)</li> <li>Use new AirWays for progress monitoring</li> </ol>
Person Responsible	Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#2	
Title	Increase ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	We grew 5% to 58% compared to the previous year but we would like to increase this component to 61%
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase ELA Learning Gains by 3%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence- based Strategy	ELA/Reading teachers will focus on differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all our students. Increase the number of intensive reading sections for our struggling readers. Teachers will chunk standards in order to cover the curriculum. Teachers will begin to use critical concepts. Increase the number of Chromebooks in the classroom to help with progress monitoring and enhance learning.
Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy	Extra time in reading has proven to increase reading achievement. Critical concepts will ensure teachers will teach standards at the rigor necessary to increase achievement. We will use AirWays to monitor progress.
Action Step	
Description	<ol> <li>Increase number of intensive reading sections</li> <li>Reading teachers will use iReady and IXL to support reading instruction</li> <li>Teacher piloting Extreme Reading Program (7th grade reading block)</li> <li>Use new AirWays for progress monitoring</li> <li>S.</li> </ol>
Person Responsible	Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3	
Title	Increase Math Lowest 25% Gains
Rationale	We decreased 7% in this component compared to the previous year. Our goal is to increase 4% to 65%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to increase 4% in this area to 65%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence- based Strategy	Math department will ensure instruction is aligned with state standards. Teachers will also focus on differentiated instruction. Continue intensive math blocks in all grade levels for our struggling math students. Teachers will begin to use critical concepts to ensure instruction is aligned to standards. Increase the number of Chromebooks in the classroom to help with progress monitoring and enhance learning.
Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy	Extra time in math has proven to increase math achievement. Critical concepts will ensure teachers will teach standards at the rigor necessary to increase achievement. We will use AirWays to monitor progress.
Action Step	
Description	<ol> <li>Chunk Standards</li> <li>Continue to focus on aligning 6th grade instruction to standards</li> <li>Increase the number of intensive math sections</li> <li>Continue using SIM strategies</li> <li>Use AirWays for progress monitoring</li> </ol>
Person Responsible	Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#4	
Title	Increase ELA Lowest 25% Gains
Rationale	Even though we were 9% above the state average in this component we feel we can increase by 2%
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to increase ELA Lowest 25% Gains by 2%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence- based Strategy	ELA/Reading teachers will focus on differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all our students. Increase the number of intensive reading sections for our struggling readers. Teachers will chunk standards in order to cover the curriculum. AFA will serve as academic coach to classroom teachers for struggling students. Increase the number of Chromebooks in the classroom to help with progress monitoring and enhance learning.
Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy	Extra time in reading has proven to increase reading achievement. Critical concepts will ensure teachers will teach standards at the rigor necessary to increase achievement. We will use AirWays to monitor progress.
Action Step	
Description	<ol> <li>Increase number of intensive reading sections</li> <li>Reading teachers will use iReady and IXL to support reading instruction</li> <li>Teacher piloting Extreme Reading Program (7th grade reading block)</li> <li>Use new AirWays for progress monitoring</li> <li>Use AFA to help struggling students with academics</li> </ol>
Person Responsible	Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#5	
Title	Increase ELA Achievement for our Students with Disabilities
Rationale	We increased 1% in this component compared to the previous year. Our goal was to increase by 3% and we missed the goal by 2%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to increase 2% in this area to 35%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Continue intensive reading blocks in all grade levels. Create three co-teach sections to provide 6th grade ELA instruction for our level 1 and 2 students. Increase the number of Chromebooks in the classroom to help with progress monitoring and enhance learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our co-teach model will offer more support our struggling readers. iReady and IXL has proven to be effective program for our struggling readers
Action Step	
Description	<ol> <li>Create three 6th grade sections of co-teach</li> <li>Use iReady and IXL programs for reading support</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
Person Responsible	Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@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 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, § 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.

PCMS will continue to invite parents to attend Honor Roll Assemblies with their student. We will also invite them to attend our Family Canter events scheduled throughout the year. Parent communication from the school will be through the School Messenger system and Remind App. We will also send out a

quarterly Terrier Times Newsletter for parents. We will continue our big family event - Career Night in February. Our new website will be utilized to share important information to our school community and parents.

#### 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.

-In the spring, PCMS hosts Sixth Grade Riser Orientation. The fifth grade students and their parents are invited to

an orientation at PCMS. Parents are invited to walk the campus, meet teachers, and are given an overview of the

school day.

-Invite sixth grade risers to tour the campus in the spring.

-Guidance counselors and student representatives will visit feeder schools.

-In the month of August, parents and students are invited back to school for an open house symposium. During

the open house, parents can follow their child's schedule, meet and greet their child's teachers, and hear presentations on the various clubs and activities available to students. Topics for presentations include academic

and behavioral expectations, dress code, schedule changes, etc.

-In the spring, the high school guidance department visits with 8th grade students to review high school course

selections and discuss course requirements.

-SAC schedules a parent information session in the spring for 8th grade parents. The high school leadership

team is invited to share their school's requirements, course selections, and clubs and activities available to 9th

grade students with them.

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

Academic and behavioral warning systems help to identify students in need of interventions through a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). Early and timely interventions occur by having a system that alerts us of the concerns. Currently, the district has three systems that provide information to help make timely adjustments necessary for Student Success.

-Focus-this program provides a variety of district reports regarding retention, referrals, ESE and ELL status, and

attendance. Focus automatically generates 5 day and 10 day attendance letters to communicate a concern to

the parents (guardians). In addition to the existing Focus reports, the Information Communications System

(ICS) team is available to support school-based criteria for custom reports

-iReady, and School Portal-data network provide a wide variety of academic reports that address both local

and state assessment results. They use a color-coded system and filters which provide our teachers, administrators, counselors, and social workers with the opportunity to clearly see/identify students in need of

intervention.

It is the responsibility of the Principal, Assistant Principal, and District Personnel to determine the most

efficient use of these programs. Principals and Assistant Principals meet with District Personnel monthly to review and discuss the effectiveness of programs, personnel and funding issues.

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.

-Mi Futuro with Wal-Mart - Mentors from Wal-Mart visit once a month to mentor students and share lessons on careers.

-WeatherSTEM program will be offered to our science students highlighting careers in weather and agriculture.

-Continue to identify students for the Take Stock in Children Scholarship Program.

- Holding a Career Night to expose students, parents, and community members to options for career choices by visiting displays and presentations by area professionals.

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

-My Career Shines Program for eighth grade students.

-College and Career Planning curriculum will be taught through US History classes

### Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase ELA Achievement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase ELA Learning Gains	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Math Lowest 25% Gains	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase ELA Lowest 25% Gains	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase ELA Achievement for our Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
		Total:	\$0.00