

Charlotte County Public Schools

# Punta Gorda Middle School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Punta Gorda Middle School

1001 EDUCATION AVE, Punta Gorda, FL 33950

<http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/pgms>

## Demographics

**Principal: Samuel Davis**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2014

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 88%   |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (53%)<br>2017-18: B (55%)<br>2016-17: B (55%)<br>2015-16: C (51%)<br>2014-15: C (53%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   |   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |

| ESSA Status  | TS&I |
|--|------|
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> . |      |

### 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Punta Gorda Middle School

1001 EDUCATION AVE, Punta Gorda, FL 33950

<http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/pgms>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | No                     | 79%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 28%  |

### School Grades History

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

### 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.**

Punta Gorda Middle School Mission Statement:

Relentlessly pursuing academic and personal growth.

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

Punta Gorda Middle School Vision Statement

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

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

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

| Name              | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Dionisio, Tina    | Principal           | Principal, Tina Dionisio, establishes clearly defined roles and expectations for the PGMS leadership team and leads the school overall. Mrs. Dionisio communicates the school's vision and mission to all stakeholders. She functions as the school's primary spokesperson. She establishes expectations which are rigorous, clearly defined, and measurable. She models open communication and speaks frankly about both success and failure. Mrs. Dionisio's leadership fosters a highly collaborative atmosphere where the sharing of ideas is encouraged. She personally evaluates the performance of all first-year teachers as well as many staff members. She is the administrative leader for the math, science and exploratory departments. She is the school's liaison to the District Leadership Team. She oversees the school's budget, makes final decisions regarding facility use, teacher assignments, and the master schedule. Mrs. Dionisio serves as co-chair of the PPC. |
| Nicklas, Scott    | Assistant Principal | Dr. Scott Nicklas is assistant principal for facilities and is the administrative leader of our ESE programs. He oversees all issues related to school safety, including the scheduling and carrying out of fire, tornado, and code red drills. He supervises and evaluates all custodial staff. He coordinates the scheduling of building maintenance and repairs and ensures proper upkeep of campus grounds. He is the administrative sponsor of our school's PBS (Positive Behavior Support) team. Dr. Nicklas is also the school's Athletic Director. He assigns and oversees all coaches, publishes academic and behavior requirements for all players and monitors compliance with the district guidelines for middle school athletes. Dr. Nicklas also oversees all school activities including clubs & intramurals. He leads our PARAs and he handles bus requests. He supervises the administration of our SEA students and handles school inventory including textbooks.          |
| Davey, Mike       | Assistant Principal | Dr. Michael Davey is assistant principal for curriculum. He is the administrative leader for the ELA, social studies, and technology departments, and he evaluates all teachers in these units. He is responsible for creating the master schedule and establishes all standardized testing schedules, coordinating the use of computer resources to meet the school's testing needs and protocols. He creates and maintains the school calendar. He oversees progress monitoring, and he is the school's technology liaison to the district office. In addition, he trains staff on a variety of software programs and leads professional development when it comes to Google Suite and Chromebooks.  |
| Portwood, Allison | Assistant Principal | Mrs. Allison Portwood is assistant principal for discipline. She handles all discipline for the school including supervision of the Dean of Students and the school security officer. She is in charge of bullying reports and the bully files. She is the PTO liaison and handles reassignment requests and terminations. She oversees our reading and remedial teachers and handles observations and evaluations for these instructional staff. She also coordinates school volunteers.  |

## 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 | 416 | 409 | 374 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1199  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37  | 34  | 38  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 109   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9   | 32  | 21  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 62    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47  | 62  | 77  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 186   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 113 | 104 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 344   |
|                                 | 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 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | 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 | 121 | 193 | 160 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 474   |

**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 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| 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)**

64

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

Thursday 9/5/2019

**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 | 42 | 50 | 48 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 140   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 24 | 42 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 85    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 33 | 25 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 75    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 86 | 80 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 225   |

**The number of students 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 | 34 | 43 | 45 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 122   |

**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 | 42 | 50 | 48 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 140 |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 24 | 42 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 85  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 33 | 25 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 75  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 86 | 80 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 225 |       |

**The number of students 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 | 34 | 43 | 45 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 122 |       |

**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             | 49%    | 54%      | 54%   | 52%    | 50%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 45%    | 53%      | 54%   | 54%    | 52%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 38%    | 46%      | 47%   | 48%    | 42%      | 44%   |
| Math Achievement            | 61%    | 63%      | 58%   | 60%    | 59%      | 56%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 52%    | 61%      | 57%   | 54%    | 58%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 40%    | 50%      | 51%   | 39%    | 46%      | 50%   |
| Science Achievement         | 53%    | 59%      | 51%   | 52%    | 54%      | 50%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 83%    | 78%      | 72%   | 76%    | 78%      | 70%   |

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |          |          | Total     |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------|
|                                 | 6                                 | 7        | 8        |           |
| Number of students enrolled     | 416 (0)                           | 409 (0)  | 374 (0)  | 1199 (0)  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 37 (42)                           | 34 (50)  | 38 (48)  | 109 (140) |
| One or more suspensions         | 9 (19)                            | 32 (24)  | 21 (42)  | 62 (85)   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 47 (17)                           | 62 (33)  | 77 (25)  | 186 (75)  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 127 (59)                          | 113 (86) | 104 (80) | 344 (225) |
|                                 | 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 | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2019 | 45%    | 49%      | -4%                        | 54%   | -9%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 54%    | 48%      | 6%                         | 52%   | 2%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 47%    | 46%      | 1%                         | 52%   | -5%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 54%    | 51%      | 3%                         | 51%   | 3%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 51%    | 56%      | -5%                        | 56%   | -5%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 56%    | 57%      | -1%                        | 58%   | -2%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2019 | 53%    | 51%      | 2%                         | 55%   | -2%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 57%    | 46%      | 11%                        | 52%   | 5%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -4%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 62%    | 62%      | 0%                         | 54%   | 8%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 61%    | 64%      | -3%                        | 54%   | 7%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 44%    | 47%      | -3%                        | 46%   | -2%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 40%    | 45%      | -5%                        | 45%   | -5%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -17%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                    | 2019 | 53%    | 55%      | -2%                        | 48%   | 5%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 48%    | 53%      | -5%                        | 50%   | -2%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2018         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 83%    | 78%      | 5%                    | 71%   | 12%                |
| 2018         | 75%    | 78%      | -3%                   | 71%   | 4%                 |
| Compare      |        | 8%       |                       |       |                    |
| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2018         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 96%    | 64%      | 32%                   | 61%   | 35%                |
| 2018         | 96%    | 72%      | 24%                   | 62%   | 34%                |
| Compare      |        | 0%       |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 0%     | 62%      | -62%                  | 57%   | -57%               |
| 2018         | 0%     | 60%      | -60%                  | 56%   | -56%               |
| Compare      |        | 0%       |                       |       |                    |

### 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                                       | 21       | 33     | 31          | 29        | 41      | 43           | 21       | 53      | 36        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 45       | 71     | 71          | 52        | 41      | 7            |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 73       | 55     |             | 95        | 82      |              | 70       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 40       | 40     | 32          | 44        | 37      | 34           | 27       | 88      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 43       | 47     | 45          | 53        | 49      | 35           | 45       | 87      | 46        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 53       | 66     | 54          | 60        | 52      | 38           | 74       | 80      | 81        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 50       | 43     | 37          | 63        | 53      | 41           | 55       | 82      | 60        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 41       | 42     | 35          | 53        | 49      | 41           | 47       | 80      | 47        |                   |                     |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 26       | 47     | 44          | 29        | 48      | 43           | 22       | 49      | 10        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 40       | 33     |             | 33        | 40      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 80       | 64     |             | 92        | 80      |              |          | 90      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 41       | 54     | 45          | 45        | 40      | 32           | 33       | 61      | 56        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 49       | 45     | 32          | 51        | 44      | 36           | 42       | 77      | 48        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 64       | 63     |             | 68        | 59      | 50           | 54       | 78      |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 57       | 56     | 51          | 62        | 55      | 45           | 51       | 78      | 53        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 47       | 52     | 47          | 52        | 51      | 43           | 40       | 73      | 42        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 15       | 37     | 40          | 15        | 29      | 24           | 13       | 47      | 30        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 38       | 62     |             | 29        | 57      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 78       | 73     |             | 91        | 82      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 38       | 48     | 40          | 42        | 52      | 38           | 32       | 73      | 45        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 46       | 50     | 38          | 47        | 47      | 33           | 37       | 73      | 48        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 61       | 54     |             | 64        | 57      |              | 44       |         | 45        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 54       | 55     | 51          | 64        | 55      | 40           | 57       | 76      | 63        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 44       | 51     | 45          | 51        | 50      | 38           | 44       | 66      | 52        |                   |                     |

### 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  | 52   |
| 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 | 43   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 523  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 34   |
| 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                                      | 47  |
| 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   | 75  |
| 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                                | 43  |
| 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  | 50  |
| 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   | 62  |
| 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   | 54  |
| 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                                | 48 |
| 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.

6th Grade ELA and 8th Grade Regular math should the lowest performance levels. We believe our reading plan for last year was not as effective as it could have been and have developed a new reading plan for the 19-20 SY. Also, one of our 6th grade ELA/Reading teachers had a personal tragedy that may have had an impact. As for math, we had some new, first-year teachers who needed grooming. We also had leadership changes mid-year that impacted the effectiveness of our curricular and instructional leadership. The overall three-year trend has been negative.

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

ELA overall and 6th grade ELA in particular showed the greatest declines. We continue to experience rapid growth in our overall student population. We believe our reading plan for last year was not as effective as it could have been and have developed a new reading plan for the 19-20 SY. We also experienced an internet outage in the middle of ELA testing that we think played a negative role in terms of overall student test performance.

#### 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.

6th, 7th, and 8th ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Again, we believe the growth in our student population, our reading plan for last year and the internet outage in the middle of ELA testing impacted student performance. We don't really see any trends as there was no decline last year for 6th and 7th and for 8th the decline was less this year than last year.

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

Civics showed the most improvement. The civics teachers are very team oriented and use data to drive assessment and instruction in highly effective ways. They are vigilant when it comes to changing instruction to bring it in alignment with what the data indicates about student needs. They have eliminated any "fluff" from their lesson plans, and they are deeply familiar with the state standards.

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

The data suggests that there is a strong correlation between our ELA scores (344 level 1's) and other state testing areas. As long as this is the case, we need to prioritize the improvement of ELA

instruction and student testing performance as doing so has the potential to impact every other core subject area.

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

1. ELA scores across all grade levels
2. SWD scores in ELA
3. Lowest 25% scores in ELA
4. Lowest 25% scores in Math
5. 8th grade Science scores

### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**



| #1  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title</b>  | ELA Reading Across all Grade Levels  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Our ELA scores are our greatest area of concern and show the greatest gap between our scores and the state average.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | We hope to achieve a minimum ELA Achievement score of 59% or +10 percentage points from 18-19.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Mike Davey (michael.davey@yourcharlotteschools.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Progress monitoring using the new Airways system; curricular and instructional development towards implementation of the CCPS critical concepts model; PGMS reading plan.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Because best practice requires leadership to monitor progress over the course of the entire year; progress monitoring by teachers is vital for formative assessment and instructional modifications as needed; critical concepts are part of a county-wide initiative to facilitate shared instruction and assessment as well as rigorous instruction of state standards.  |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PGMS Reading Plan - A schoolwide, integrated, team-based approach to targeting learning gains among 1s and 2s.</li> <li>2. Every subject area "teaches reading" (continuation of PGMS Writing Initiative with modifications) - All subjects take two days out of each month for an informational text reading and writing assignment. Also, vocabulary instruction in all subject areas (context-based).</li> <li>3. Reading Co-Teacher (as per referendum) - Reading specialist utilizing pull-out strategy for all 1s and 2s across all three grade levels; iReady and MobyMax remediation tools</li> <li>4. Administrative oversight of instructional and curricular coordination among reading, ELA and computer classes - APC monitors sharing of instructional goals, assignments and instructional tools among the three classes. Progress monitoring results used to coordinate support of reading and ELA in computer classes. PD and PLC as appropriate.</li> <li>5. Computer Classes - Targeted Student Learning Support for Reading with Built-in Rewards and Incentives for all students designated as needing reading intervention. iReady and MobyMax reading remediation priority over certs for targeted students.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Mike Davey (michael.davey@yourcharlotteschools.net)  |

| #2  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Title</b>  | SWD in ELA   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | This is the only sub-group below the Federal Index threshold. We are at 34% and the threshold is 41%.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | We plan to rise above the Federal Index threshold and reach 47%, returning us to our 2018 level.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Mike Davey (michael.davey@yourcharlotteschools.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | Progress monitoring using the new Airways system; curricular and instructional development towards implementation of the CCPS critical concepts model; PGMS reading plan. SIIPS reading program with targeted interventions on specific focus-skills. PGMS push-in model.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Because best practice requires leadership to monitor progress over the course of the entire year; progress monitoring by teachers is vital for formative assessment and instructional modifications as needed; critical concepts are part of a county-wide initiative to facilitate shared instruction and assessment as well as rigorous instruction of state standards. Also, SIIPS reading program is designed for struggling readers below developmental level. PGMS push-in model is innovative and unique to the county in using fully certified teachers to supplement instruction.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PGMS Reading Plan - A schoolwide, integrated, team-based approach to targeting learning gains among 1s and 2s.</li> <li>2. Every subject area "teaches reading" (continuation of PGMS Writing Initiative with modifications) - All subjects take two days out of each month for an informational text reading and writing assignment. Also, vocabulary instruction in all subject areas (context-based).</li> <li>3. Reading Co-Teacher (as per referendum) - Reading specialist utilizing pull-out strategy for all 1s and 2s across all three grade levels; iReady and MobyMax remediation tools</li> <li>4. Administrative oversight of instructional and curricular coordination among reading, ELA and computer classes - APC monitors sharing of instructional goals, assignments and instructional tools among the three classes. Progress monitoring results used to coordinate support of reading and ELA in computer classes. PD and PLC as appropriate.</li> <li>5. Computer Classes - Targeted Student Learning Support for Reading with Built-in Rewards and Incentives for all students designated as needing reading intervention. iReady and MobyMax reading remediation priority over certs for targeted students.</li> <li>6. Learning Strategies Classes - Targeted Student Learning Support for Reading with Built-in Rewards and Incentives for all students designated as requiring reading intervention. iReady Reading priority over certs for targeted students. Sixth Grade "Success" Classes with Reading Cohorts</li> <li>7. Thorough pre-year review of reading curriculum, pedagogy and materials, adding SIIPS and PGMS Push-In Model.</li> </ol> |

**Person Responsible** Mike Davey (michael.davey@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).**

By using our PLC set up, we will continue implementing the CCPS critical concepts program to guide curriculum and instruction in all grade levels. We will be meeting and coordinating with the county C and I specialist for science to address our science scores. Science is in year two of utilizing iXI to enhance instruction of material from the 6th and 7th-grade science curricula. All classes with SWDs will receive the same intensive reading support, including pullouts by the county-designated student reading coach. Lower 25s in ELA will receive the same intensive reading support, including pullouts by the county-designated student reading coach. Lower 25s in math: teachers will employ shared planning during PLCs using critical concepts to target lower 25s, including shared assessments, progress monitoring via Airways, and shared formative assessment.