

Charlotte County Public Schools

Punta Gorda Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 7/14/2014

2019-20 Status (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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

This plan 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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Punta Gorda Middle School

1001 EDUCATION AVE, Punta Gorda, FL 33950

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

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	No	75%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

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

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
McLain, Renee	Assistant Principal	Ms. Renee McLain is assistant principal for discipline. She handles all discipline for the school including supervision of the Dean of Students and the school security officers. She is in charge of bullying reports and the bully files. She is the PTO liaison and handles reassignment requests and terminations. She also coordinates school volunteers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/14/2014, Samuel Davis

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.*

1

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

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

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	315	306	309	0	0	0	0	930
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	78	68	0	0	0	0	200
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	63	41	0	0	0	0	173
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	29	13	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	45	18	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	41	71	0	0	0	0	158
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	50	60	0	0	0	0	170

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	15	30	57	0	0	0	0	102

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	5	3	4	0	0	0	0	12
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 9/8/2020

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	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	

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	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	9	
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	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	

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	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	9	
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	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	
	(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	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%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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		

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
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	524
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
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	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
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	54
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	48
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.

6th Grade ELA and 8th Grade Regular math showed the lowest performance levels two years ago. There were other factors detailed in the SIP for 19-20. We have data from the Spring period of virtual

instruction suggesting that our reading plan was working. We have refined the reading plan for this year.

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 two years ago. We experienced rapid growth in our overall student population. 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. We believe the reading plan in 18-19 was not effective. We made changes for 19-20 and have made additional refinements for 2020-2021.

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 18-19 and the internet outage in the middle of ELA testing impacted student performance. We have no data from last year to identify any trends, but we have no reason to think that the issues identified in the SIP for 19-20 are no longer relevant.

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?

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

We have developed a more comprehensive reading plan for 20-21, building on the changes implemented in 19-20. We have added instructional software resources including MobyMax and STAR 360. We have refined our ESE push-in plan, and we are now one-to-one in terms of students and Chromebooks. We also are "attacking the gaps" with supplemental targeted progress monitoring. And we are using STAR 360 in our reading classes. And we are fully implementing the CCPS critical concepts program to guide curriculum and instruction in all grade levels. 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.

Measurable Outcome:

We hope to achieve a minimum ELA Achievement score of 59% or +10 percentage points from 18-19.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mike Davey (michael.davey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Reading Level 1s: TIER 2 Intervention: MobyMax, 3-5 sessions per week, 20-30 minutes per session; Tier 3 Reading Class and STAR 360 Supplemental Targeted Progress Monitoring
Reading Level 2s: TIER 2 Intervention: 3-5 sessions per week; 20-30 per session

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

MobyMax is rated "strong" according to the ESSA Evidence Based Interventions criteria.

Action Steps to Implement

Targeted scheduling: We do a data drill-down to identify various student cohorts (from TAG to math support to reading) to make sure that we put students in classes where they will benefit the most. This supports and facilitates differentiated instruction and targeted instruction.

Person Responsible

Mike Davey (michael.davey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Supplementary instructional software - we currently have several instructional software platforms including: MobyMax, MyOn, Math 180, Star 360, IXL and ClearSight. We have created a detailed eInstructional Resource map so that we use the various platforms for different and specific purposes. This eliminates confusion among both students and teachers. This, in turn, facilitates targeted instruction and allows us to make sure that students receive the maximum benefits from the teachers' use of the platforms. The various platforms are used in the following ways: progress monitoring, supplemental targeted progress monitoring, enhanced instruction, remediation, and credit recovery.

Person Responsible

Mike Davey (michael.davey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Increased progress monitoring: In addition to state mandated progress monitoring we are using some of our eInstructional resources for supplemental targeted progress monitoring. For example, we expect teachers to regularly do formative assessments and diagnostics of our L25s. We are also "attacking the gaps" by aggressively identifying students who may have fallen behind due to the loss of face-to-face instruction fourth quarter of SY 2019-2020.

Person Responsible Mike Davey (michael.davey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Targeted instruction: Targeted Instruction is the alignment of specific student needs to established learning goals, using data to identify and categorize those needs and to then provide appropriate instruction. Our data-intensive approach to targeted scheduling allows teachers to differentiate in highly effective ways. And it allows us to channel resources that are most appropriate for the students concerned.

Person Responsible Mike Davey (michael.davey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: We hope to improve our Math scores across the board.

Measurable Outcome: A 5 point Math achievement gain overall (target: 66% proficient); a 10 point improvement in learning gains overall (target 62%); and a 10 point L25 Improvement (target 50%).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mike Davey (michael.davey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We have added instructional software resources including MobyMax, STAR 360 and Math 180. We have refined our targeted scheduling, differentiating more fully our math sections in the master schedule, including the addition of a second tier of math instruction and support; refined our ESE push-in plan, and are now one-to-one in terms of students and Chromebooks. We also are "attacking the gaps" with supplemental targeted progress monitoring. And we are using Math 180 in our second tier math sections.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

MobyMax is rated "strong" according to the ESSA Evidence Based Interventions criteria. Both STAR 360 and Math 180 have a proven record of improving student learning outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

Targeted scheduling: We do a data drill-down to identify various student cohorts (from TAG to math support to reading) to make sure that we put students in classes where they will benefit the most. This supports and facilitates differentiated instruction and targeted instruction.

Person**Responsible**

Mike Davey (michael.davey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Supplementary instructional software - we currently have several instructional software platforms including: MobyMax, MyOn, Math 180, Star 360, IXL and ClearSight. We have created a detailed eInstructional Resource map so that we use the various platforms for different and specific purposes. This eliminates confusion among both students and teachers. This, in turn, facilitates targeted instruction and allows us to make sure that students receive the maximum benefits from the teachers' use of the platforms. The various platforms are used in the following ways: progress monitoring, supplemental targeted progress monitoring, enhanced instruction, remediation, and credit recovery.

Person**Responsible**

Mike Davey (michael.davey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Increased progress monitoring: In addition to state mandated progress monitoring we are using some of our eInstructional resources for supplemental targeted progress monitoring. For example, we expect teachers to regularly do formative assessments and . We are also "attacking the gaps" by aggressively identifying students who may have fallen behind due to the loss of face-to-face instruction fourth quarter of SY 2019-2020.

Person**Responsible**

Mike Davey (michael.davey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Targeted instruction: Targeted Instruction is the alignment of specific student needs to established learning goals, using data to identify and categorize those needs and to then provide appropriate

instruction. Our data-intensive approach to targeted scheduling allows teachers to differentiate in highly effective ways. And it allows us to channel resources that are most appropriate for the students concerned.

Person Responsible Mike Davey (michael.davey@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will continue implementing the CCPS critical concepts program to guide curriculum and instruction in all grade levels. Science is in year three of utilizing iXl 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. We have added a new tier of math instruction including the use of Math 180 and STAR 360.

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.

PGMS meets regularly with the School Advisory Committee to inform them on school plans and consult with them about school needs. The SAC is diverse and represents the wider community of stakeholder groups. We also have a vibrant communication strategy to alert stakeholders about important and timely information pertaining to the school. During normal school operations, the school hosts many community organizations and clubs. A school board representative is in regular contact with the Principal. Our PTO organization plays a vital role in hosting school events and raising discretionary funds. The Principal serves on the board of Drug Free Punta Gorda. And Drug Free Charlotte County is a regular presence in the school.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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