

Charlotte County Public Schools

# Port Charlotte Middle School



## 2020-21 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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

# Port Charlotte Middle School

23000 MIDWAY BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33952

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/pcm>

## Demographics

**Principal: Matthew Kunder**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (52%)
<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>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

## 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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

## Port Charlotte Middle School

23000 MIDWAY BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33952

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/pcm>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	86%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

### School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	B

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

### 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 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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 with program 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

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 7/28/2020, Matthew Kunder

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

44

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (52%)
<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>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	228	245	205	0	0	0	0	678	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	57	44	0	0	0	0	151	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	16	0	0	0	0	55	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	25	0	0	0	0	51	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	12	0	0	0	0	28	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	58	57	0	0	0	0	169	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	51	33	0	0	0	0	130	

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	36	40	21	0	0	0	0	97	

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	1	2	11	0	0	0	0	14	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/28/2020

### 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		
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	

**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	5	21	9	0	0	0	0	35

**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	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		

**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		
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	

**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	5	21	9	0	0	0	0	35

**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	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		

## 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	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%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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.**

ELA						
Grade	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 Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	49%	46%	3%	52%	-3%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	51%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	60%	56%	4%	56%	4%
	2018	60%	57%	3%	58%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

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

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	84%	78%	6%	71%	13%
2018	86%	78%	8%	71%	15%
Compare		-2%			
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	94%	64%	30%	61%	33%
2018	93%	72%	21%	62%	31%
Compare		1%			
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	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 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	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 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	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			

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
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	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%	0

## 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?**

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 Focus:**



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus** Increase ELA Achievement - 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.

**Description and Rationale:**

**Measurable Outcome:** 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:** Aligned instruction with the state standards and focus on differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all our students. We will continue intensive reading blocks for our struggling readers.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Focusing on the state standards has proven to be effective in increasing student achievement on the FSA. Critical concepts will ensure teachers teach standards at the rigor necessary to increase achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will use the Critical Concepts to focus on the state standards
2. Teachers will differentiate instruction to help all learners
3. Use Clearsight to monitor progress of students throughout the year and provide interventions for students not showing adequate

**Person Responsible** Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Increase ELA Learning Gains - We grew 5% to 58% compared to the previous year but we would like to increase this component to 61%

**Measurable Outcome:** To increase ELA Learning Gains by 3%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Aligned instruction with the state standards and focus on differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all our students. Reading teachers will use IXL for struggling students to provide additional practice skills for mastery. We will continue intensive reading blocks for our struggling readers.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Focusing on the state standards has proven to be effective in increasing student achievement on the FSA. IXL has proven to be an effective strategy for struggling readers. Critical concepts will ensure teachers teach standards at the rigor necessary to increase achievement. Extra time in reading has proven to increase reading achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will use the Critical Concepts to focus on the state standards
2. Teachers will prescribe IXL to students who struggle mastering the skills necessary to be successful
2. Teachers will differentiate instruction to help all learners
3. Use ClearSight to monitor progress of students throughout the year and provide interventions for students not showing adequate
4. Increase number of intensive reading sections
5. Use new ClearSight to monitor progress on students and provide interventions for students not making adequate

**Person Responsible** Matt Kunder (matt..kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Increase Math Lowest 25% Gains - We decreased 7% in this component compared to the previous year. Our goal is to increase 4% to 65%.

**Measurable Outcome:** Our goal is to increase 4% in this area to 65%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tara Whisenant (tara.whisenant@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Our math teachers will use SIM strategies to increase student achievement and also use Critical Concepts to align instruction with the state standards. Continue intensive math blocks in all grade levels for our struggling math students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** SIM has proven to be an effective strategy to increase achievement and our students have shown positive gains the last few years. Extra time in math has proven to increase math achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Use SIM strategies often
2. Teachers will also focus on differentiated instruction.
3. Teachers will use Critical Concepts to ensure instruction is aligned to standards.
4. Continue to schedule intensive math blocks for our struggling math students
5. Use Clearsight to monitor progress and provide interventions for students not making adequate

**Person Responsible:** Tara Whisenant (tara.whisenant@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Increase ELA Lowest 25% Gains - Even though we were 9% above the state average in this component we feel we can increase by 2%

**Measurable Outcome:**

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:**

Level 1 students will use IXL, as prescribed by their teacher, to practice skills for mastery that match their areas of deficiency as well as complete progress monitoring and diagnostic tests to track progress and identify areas of need of intervention. We will schedule struggling readers (level 1) into intensive reading blocks in all grade levels. ELA/Reading teachers will focus on differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all our students. .

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

IXL has proven to be effective for struggling readers at PCMS in addition to research conducted by IXL which shows a 7 percentile point increase on FSA for students using IXL for one year. Our intensive reading blocks has increased reading levels with our struggling readers and the use of IXL has also proven successful. . We will use AirWays to monitor progress.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Increase the number of intensive reading sections for level 1 students
2. Teachers will use Critical concepts to ensure the standards are taught
2. Reading teachers will use iReady and IXL to support reading instruction
3. Teachers will chunk standards in order to cover the curriculum.
4. Monitor progress of level 1 and 2 students at minimum 3 times throughout the school year
- 5 Provide interventions for students not showing adequate progress compared to their peers

**Person Responsible**

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus** Increase ELA Achievement for our Students with Disabilities - 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%.

**Description and Rationale:**

**Measurable Outcome:** 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:** Level 1 students will use IXL, as prescribed by their teacher, to practice skills for mastery that match their areas of deficiency as well as complete progress monitoring and diagnostic tests to track progress and identify areas of need of intervention. We will schedule struggling readers (level 1) into intensive reading blocks in all grade levels.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** IXL has proven to be effective for struggling readers at PCMS in addition to research conducted by IXL which shows a 7 percentile point increase on FSA for students using IXL for one year. Our intensive reading blocks has increased reading levels with our struggling readers and the use of IXL has also proven successful.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Schedule all level 1 students into an intensive reading program
2. Monitor progress of level 1 and 2 students at minimum 3 times throughout the school year
3. Provide interventions for students not showing adequate progress compared to their peers

**Person Responsible** Matt Kunder (matt..kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** Matt Kunder (matt..kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

NA

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

When and if allowed due to COVID-19, PCMS will continue to invite parents to attend Honor Roll Assemblies with their student. We will also invite them to attend our Family Center 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.

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.

### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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

## **Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00