

Charlotte County Public Schools

Port Charlotte High 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	28
Budget to Support Goals	29

Port Charlotte High School

18200 COCHRAN BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33948

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/pchs>

Demographics

Principal: Louis Long III

Start Date for this Principal: 3/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	100%
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 (50%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	29

Port Charlotte High School

18200 COCHRAN BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33948

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/pchs>

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)
High School 9-12	No	65%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

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

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.

The Port Charlotte High School (PCHS) mission is to promote personal, academic, and career achievement by supporting students to become independent and self-sufficient adults who will succeed and contribute with integrity and responsibility in our community at large. Through PCHS's PRIDE Initiative, all students are expected to demonstrate:

Preparation: Come to school with materials and positive attitudes.

Respect: Treat your school and peers with consideration and courtesy.

Integrity: Practice personal honesty and independence.

Determination: Set and work towards goals.

Excellence: Strive to be your best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Port Charlotte High School and its stakeholders collaborate with the intent to promote a school organization grounded in the ideals of academic rigor and integrity of character. Port Charlotte High School will promote "Student Success" by engaging in continuous improvement through the development and implementation of innovative, research-based instructional strategies that support and assist in motivating students as they seek to excel in reading, writing, math, science, social studies, world languages, fine arts, physical education, naval sciences, industry certifications, and College and Career Readiness (CACR). Port Charlotte High School's faculty and staff will experience shared decision making, a bedrock in efficacious professional growth that will enable all PCHS students to achieve on global, national, and state assessments. Port Charlotte High School will become one of the top performing high schools in the state by focusing on research-based initiatives aimed at supporting subgroups and reducing achievement gaps. Our staff will promote fidelity of task in progress monitoring and data-driven instruction for all PCHS students. Formative assessments -- teacher created, district generated, and common -- will serve as a key catalyst in achieving our vision. The realization of this vision will occur through our new school-wide initiative called EPAF, Engaging Pirates in Academic Focus.

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
Long, Lou	Principal	<p>Mr. Long serves as Port Charlotte High School's captain of the leadership team. His direct leadership responsibilities include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Community and Media Finance (Internal & District Funds) Staff Steward Graduation Rate Lead Contact School Climate and Culture Leader Assistant Principals Administrative & Office Assistants Community & Media Contact Leave Requests Supplements
Curtis, Paul	Assistant Principal	<p>Dr. Paul A. Curtis serves as Port Charlotte High School's Assistant Principal for Student Services. His direct leadership responsibilities include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AESOP Athletics Attendance Career and College Readiness (CACR) Lead True North Logic Deans Destination Graduation Discipline ESE Lead Contact Grade 12 Lead (Strauss) Paraprofessionals Professional Development Reassignments Security SERT Supervisor Support PPC Technology RTI / MTSS / Threat Assessments Textbooks
Bishop, Eric	Assistant Principal	<p>Dr. Eric C. Bishop serves as Port Charlotte High School's Assistant Principal for Curriculum. His direct leadership responsibilities include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPAF Head Advance Ed. Lead for SACS Accreditation Cambridge AICE Coordinator Advanced Placement Supervisor Career Information Center (CIC) Lead ESOL Lead Contact Grade 9/10 Lead (Balkman / Johnson)

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Guidance Professional Supervisor Master Schedule Lead NET Program Lead Partnership and Performance Council (PPC) Co-Chair Professional Leadership Community (PLC) Lead Program Planner Supervisor Registration / Withdrawals School Advisory Council (SAC) Lead School Improvement Plan (SIP) Lead Testing -- ACT, ACT NCR, SAT, SAT NCR, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 8/9, PSAT 10
Forbus, Natasha	Assistant Principal	Natasha Forbus serves as Port Charlotte High School's (PCHS) Assistant Principal for Facilities and Testing. Her direct responsibilities include but are not limited to: 11th Grade AP (Reilly) Administrative Coverage Capital Outlay Custodial Services (Neff) Emergency/Crisis Plans Inventory Master Calendar Testing (FSA/EOC) Underclassmen Awards

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 3/1/2015, Louis Long III

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

88

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	100%
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 (50%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	0	0	0	0	297	337	314	374	1322
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	45	39	57	196
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	59	47	31	172
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	136	105	97	396
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	64	71	123	314
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	53	69	102	309
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	55	45	42	198

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	0	0	0	75	80	66	90	311

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	0	0	2	0	2	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	8

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/7/2020

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	0	0	0	406	420	439	393	1658	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	52	70	223	409	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	88	44	17	210	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	175	85	126	524	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	128	82	48	359	

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	0	0	0	108	110	122	134	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	0	0	0	10	5	0	15	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	9	

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	0	0	0	0	406	420	439	393	1658
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	52	70	223	409
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	88	44	17	210
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	175	85	126	524
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	128	82	48	359

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	0	0	0	108	110	122	134	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	0	0	0	10	5	0	15	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	1	9	

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	42%	62%	56%	48%	61%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	38%	54%	51%	47%	55%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	45%	42%	41%	50%	41%
Math Achievement	43%	64%	51%	41%	64%	49%
Math Learning Gains	47%	56%	48%	34%	51%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	52%	45%	26%	47%	39%
Science Achievement	67%	72%	68%	60%	78%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	80%	73%	70%	78%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	39%	53%	-14%	55%	-16%
	2018	52%	53%	-1%	53%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	43%	52%	-9%	53%	-10%
	2018	45%	53%	-8%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	71%	-5%	67%	-1%
2018	60%	69%	-9%	65%	-5%
Compare		6%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	76%	-7%	70%	-1%
2018	74%	75%	-1%	68%	6%
Compare		-5%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	28%	64%	-36%	61%	-33%
2018	59%	72%	-13%	62%	-3%
Compare		-31%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	51%	62%	-11%	57%	-6%
2018	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%
Compare		-8%			

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	29	30	23	31		38	41		88	18
ELL	24	23	23	33	45		38				
ASN	65	50		57	54		73				
BLK	34	34	24	30	37		62	54		85	28
HSP	40	40	36	38	29	20	61	67		94	50
MUL	38	32		26	36		71	71		94	33
WHT	45	39	28	49	54	45	70	73		91	39
FRL	35	35	27	35	44	38	60	64		88	38
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	21	32	30	42	44	44	38	57		62	17
ELL	12	27	27							64	
ASN	58	73		79	73						
BLK	36	40	32	53	52	38	47	55		83	20
HSP	45	44	36	67	57	33	61	72		88	36
MUL	47	43		65	53		56	69		82	
WHT	53	50	42	64	51	39	67	79		86	45
FRL	45	46	41	62	55	42	57	69		84	35

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	32	30	13	29	27	10	27		74	5
ELL	10	42	45	8	17						
ASN	67	42		50	27						
BLK	39	49	41	29	27	21	42	63		84	14
HSP	43	43	33	33	29	22	48	73		88	20
MUL	32	48		32	25		67	81		82	43
WHT	52	48	42	46	37	31	66	69		84	37
FRL	43	44	37	37	32	27	55	67		81	25

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	549
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	60
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	43
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	47
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	50
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	53
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	45
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.

The data component that demonstrated the greatest area of need was ELA Achievement, Learning Gains, and Lowest 25 Percent performance. Several factors contributed to the 18-19 low performance, including but not limited to: personnel absenteeism (maternity leave, illness, in-county transfer), personnel realignment, resource deficiency, progress monitoring instrument deficiency, detrimental additional enrollment due to Free and Reduced Lunch status change, the addition of historically low performers in grade 9 (18-19), loss of high achieving students to a charter school, an influx of low-performing, reassigned students, and lack of student motivation to learn. The low performance in the ELA areas of achievement, gains, and L25 is not a trend and indicates an anomaly in relation to virtually all prior years' data sets.

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

The data component that demonstrated the greatest decline from the previous year was Math Achievement. The primary factor that contributed to this decline was the return of students to the test pool that were held out of Algebra to receive intensive immediate instruction (iii) via Algebra I-A. This push-in, pull-out plan calls for students to be enrolled in a non-EOC bearing course in which pupils will receive targeted support in deficient areas to increase the likelihood of increasing achievement in the following academic year. The ebb and flow of this cycle, if aligned to work in concert with other performance categories, can infuse a host of school grade points in the pull-out year while significantly decreasing performance in the subsequent push-in year. However, the pull-out model did not produce gains in this year. Hence, a realignment of instructors in all math tested areas has occurred.

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.

ELA Achievement - by a significant margin - demonstrated the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Several factors contributed to the 18-19 low performance, including but not limited to: personnel absenteeism, personnel realignment, resource deficiency, progress monitoring instrument deficiency, detrimental additional enrollment due to Free and Reduced Lunch status change, the addition of historically low performers in grade 9 (18-19), and lack of student motivation to learn. The low performance in the ELA areas of achievement, gains, and L25 is not a trend and indicates an anomaly in relation to virtually all prior years' data sets.

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

Science Achievement - the sole grading category to demonstrate growth in all of the core areas - demonstrated the most significant improvement. Areas of successful habits that this collective group adopts include but are not limited to: data chats with pupils, progress monitoring data analysis, instructional decision-making based on the results, standard alignment and monitoring, pacing guide/curriculum map adherence, and common planning.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The two primary areas of concern housed in the EWS data set are grades 9-12 course failures in ELA and math and the number of level one performers. To address, monitor, and ultimately improve this inordinate amount of failures and level one performers, the EPAF initiative has been created and installed for the 19-20 academic year.

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

1. ELA Achievement (Levels 1-5, SWD / ELL Sub-Groups)
2. Math Achievement (Levels 1-5, Algebra and Geometry, SWD / ELL Sub-Groups)
3. ELA Learning Gains (Levels 1-5, SWD / ELL Sub Groups)
4. ELA Lowest 25 % (Levels 1-2, SWD / ELL Sub Groups)
5. ESSA TS & I SWD & ELL Sub-Groups

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>This area of focus represents 634 ELA Grades 9 and 10 pupils who will consequently count in achievement, learning gains, and lowest 25% gains. Due, in part, to the significant fall in performance in ELA Grades 9,10</p> <p>Achievement, Learning Gains, and Lowest 25% Gains, Port Charlotte High School's Assessment and Accountability System grade fell from a "B" to a "C." To alter and significantly reverse this trend, PCHS has implemented the EPAF initiative, an original model grounded in research-based practices, monitoring, and teacher-generated formative assessments. Weekly meetings among all stakeholders in the tested areas and house administrators reside at the core of EPAF. The rationale behind the creation of EPAF was identified by the implementation of a staff survey in which PCHS instructors called for an "all hands on deck" focus and, in response, PCHS administrators devised the Engaging Pirates in Academic Focus initiative. 2020 represents year two of the EPAF initiative and will add a secondary meaning for the "F" in the acronym. Teacher feedback to pupils and administrator feedback to teachers via the classroom walk-through tool will serve as the major catalysts for school-wide improvement in English.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Port Charlotte High School (PCHS) plans to become an "A" school as indicated by the State of Florida's Accountability and Assessment System and seeks to earn 620 points. When this outcome is realized, PCHS will have vaulted from a "C" to an "A" ranking. For this growth to occur, PCHS plans to secure a 14 point increase in ELA Achievement (42 in 18-19 to 56 in 20-21), a 20 point increase in ELA Learning Gains (38 in 18-19 to 58 in 20-21), and a 21 point increase in ELA Lowest 25% Gains (29 in 18-19 to 50 in 20-21).</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Eric Bishop (eric.bishop@yourcharlotteschools.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Forged in successful practice and contemplated over time, PCHS's Engaging Pirates in Academic Focus (EPAF) Initiative represents the primary research-based strategy all ELA stakeholders and students will adopt to not only realize the 20-21 goal but also leave a lasting academic impression on the institution and community at large. The 20-21 primary research-based initiative dubbed EPAF, holds this statement as its primary vision: All PCHS stakeholders will rely on standards-based instruction, close monitoring of student performance, and incessant attendance tracking to ensure academic success by engaging all students in daily academic foci, weekly teacher-made and district-developed formative assessments, and teacher directed feedback to pupils. The inception of EPAF stems from the Ask, Acquire, Appraise, Apply, and Audit evidence cycle.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>The strategic rationale for implementing EPAF in ELA emanates primarily from a need to monitor these attributes: A new (20-21) Admin walk-through tool (The data show...what? Actionable feedback ensues) Daily standards posted Daily academic focus posted Weekly (critical) Bi-weekly (secondary tier) meetings with critical educators Historic data analysis to drive current practice and learning plans Rosters – Cusper identification, ESSA, SWD's, ELL's, L25, LG, LF, LY, LA, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3,4,5 Pacing Guides, Curriculum Maps Monitoring PACE Cycle - Marzano Elements Critical Concepts</p>

Learning Scales

Ongoing, year-long action plans (artifacts)

Goal setting forms

Formative assessments (common, team specific, and individual)

ClearSight / IXL

What will we do with the data acquired from FA's?

How will we measure mastery of the standards?

How will we reteach and differentiate?

Intentional scheduling aligned to common purpose

Identification of barriers / plans for deconstruction

Attendance / discipline / tardy monitoring

Action Steps to Implement

ELA EPAF Action Steps

The following list represents the strategic steps, not necessarily in order and not limited in scope and sequence, for the PCHS ELA area of focus to occur with fidelity:

1. Promote school-wide awareness and understanding of EPAF
2. Model of exemplar EPAF's
3. Form ESSA PLC's (ELL & SWD)
4. Align instructional intent with anticipated outcome
5. Install the classroom walk-through tool
6. Offer timely, actionable feedback to educators
7. Monitor ELA meetings and provide feedback when necessary
8. Hold weekly EPAF meetings with critical ELA educators
9. Hire high impact, driven educators
10. Encourage all teachers to seek ESOL and Reading endorsements
11. Ensure 100% participation in the BOY / MOY progress monitoring cycle
12. Monitor educator progress in pacing guides and curriculum maps across all disciplines
13. Collect and give feedback on all syllabi / midterms / final exams

Person

Responsible Eric Bishop (eric.bishop@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

This area of focus represents 524 Math (Algebra I, Geometry) Grades 9, 10, and 11 pupils who will consequently count in achievement, learning gains, and lowest 25% gains. Due, in part, to the significant fall in performance in Math grades 9,10, and 11 Achievement, Learning Gains, and Lowest 25% Gains, Port Charlotte High School's Assessment and Accountability System grade fell from a "B" to a "C." To alter and significantly reverse this trend, PCHS has implemented the EPAF initiative, an original model grounded in research-based practices, monitoring, and teacher-generated formative assessments. Weekly meetings among all stakeholders in the tested areas and house administrators reside at the core of EPAF. The rationale behind the creation of EPAF was identified by the implementation of a staff survey in which PCHS instructors called for an "all hands on deck" focus and, in response, PCHS administrators devised the Engaging Pirates in Academic Focus initiative. 2020 represents year two of the EPAF initiative and will add a secondary meaning for the "F" in the acronym. Teacher feedback to pupils and administrator feedback to teachers via the classroom walk-through tool will serve as the major catalysts for school-wide improvement in Math.

Measurable Outcome:

Port Charlotte High School (PCHS) plans to become an "A" school as indicated by the State of Florida's Accountability and Assessment System and seeks to earn 620 points. When this outcome is realized, PCHS will have vaulted from a "C" to an "A." For this growth to occur, PCHS plans to secure a 17 point increase in Math Achievement (43 in 18-19 to 60 in 20-21), a nine point increase in Math Learning Gains (47 in 18-19 to 56 in 20-21), and a 10 point increase in Math Lowest 25% Gains (38 in 18-19 to 48 in 20-21).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eric Bishop (eric.bishop@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Forged in successful practice and contemplated over time, PCHS's Engaging Pirates in Academic Focus (EPAF) Initiative represents the primary research-based strategy all Math (Algebra I, Geometry) stakeholders and students will adopt to not only realize the 20-21 goal but also leave a lasting academic impression on the institution and community at large. The 20-21 primary research-based initiative dubbed EPAF, holds this statement as its primary vision: All PCHS stakeholders will rely on standards-based instruction, close monitoring of student performance, and incessant attendance tracking to ensure academic success by engaging all students in daily academic foci, weekly teacher-made and district-developed formative assessments, and teacher directed feedback to pupils. The inception of EPAF stems from the Ask, Acquire, Appraise, Apply, and Audit evidence cycle.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The strategic rationale for implementing EPAF in Math (Algebra I & Geometry) emanates from a need to monitor these attributes:
 A new administrative walk-through tool (The data show...what? Actionable feedback ensues)
 Daily standards posted
 Daily academic focus posted
 Weekly (critical) Bi-weekly (secondary tier) meetings with critical educators
 Historic data analysis to drive current practice and learning plans
 Rosters – Cusper identification, ESSA, SWD's, ELL's, L25, LG, LF, LY, LA, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3,4,5
 Critical Concepts Pacing Guides, Curriculum Maps Monitoring
 PACE Cycle - Marzano Elements
 Critical Concepts Training
 Learning Scales

Ongoing, year-long action plans (artifacts)
Goal setting forms
Formative assessments (common, team specific, and individual)
ClearSight Platform
Algebra / Geometry Nation workbooks and on line platform
What type of formative assessments (FA) are given?
Why do we administer assessments?
What will we do with the data acquired from FA's?
How will we measure mastery of the standards?

Action Steps to Implement

Math EPAF Action Steps

The following list represents the strategic steps, not necessarily in order, for the PCHS Math area of focus to occur with fidelity:

1. Promote school-wide awareness of EPAF across the school house
2. Model exemplar EPAF's
3. Form ESSA PLC's (ELL & SWD)
4. Align instructional intent with anticipated outcome
5. Install the classroom walk-through tool
6. Offer timely, actionable feedback to educators
7. Monitor Algebra and Geometry meetings and provide feedback when necessary
8. Hold weekly EPAF meetings with critical Math educators
9. Hire high impact, driven educators
10. Encourage all teachers to seek targeted professional development opportunities
11. Ensure 100% participation in the BOY / MOY progress monitoring cycle
12. Monitor educator progress in pacing guides and curriculum maps across all disciplines
13. Collect and give feedback on all syllabi/ midterms / final exams

Person Responsible Eric Bishop (eric.bishop@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Port Charlotte High School is designated as a TS & I school in the ELL Sub-Group. PCHS seeks to increase from 33% in 18-19 to 50% in 20-21.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

1. The English Language Learners (ELL) subgroup, identified in the 2018-2019 SIP/ESSA as one of the Targeted Areas in need of Improvement, included ELL's enrolled in the ESOL program - fifty-one (51) students, twenty-five (25) of which were included in the calculation of achievement and learning gains. Newly enrolled students were included in testing, but their scores were not used in calculations. ELLs in their second year were included in the calculation of learning gains while ELL's beyond their second year in the program were included in both achievement and learning gains calculations.

2. As there is an influx of families moving into Charlotte County, planning for our students' success calls for PCHS to move forward to ensure success for every ELL student.

Measurable Outcome: PCHS's ELL measureable outcome includes ensuring our students move toward 100% proficiency in achievement with 100% annual increase in learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eric Bishop (eric.bishop@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Three strategies will focus our action plans to provide support for Port Charlotte High School's ELL's:

- a. Developing Positive Family Relationships
- b. Staff and Resources
- c. Student Social-Emotional Needs

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for these strategies emanate from the outlined requirements from ESSA / SIP and from the foundation of sound language acquisition theory and practice.

Action Steps to Implement

Developing Positive Family Relationships

1. Families registering students receive documents translated in Spanish and Haitian Creole and begin an articulated process of testing, placement, scheduling, and welcoming entrance to PCHS. Families will be met with a process to communicate in their first language.
2. Translators/translator services are available for conferences, transcripts, and IEP's.
3. All letters home will be translated.

Staff and Resources

1. ELLs will be scheduled with "effective" content teachers with ESOL certification.
2. Content teachers will be alerted to the ELL status(LY, LF, LA) of their students through the FOCUS data system.

Student Social-Emotional Needs

1. Concerted focus for ELLs to enroll in College and Career (CACR) opportunities through enrollment of AP, Cambridge AICE, Dual Enrollment, and Industry Certification - bearing courses.
2. LY ELLS will format a career portfolio using Career Cruising and MySunshineCareer.

Person Responsible Eric Bishop (eric.bishop@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Port Charlotte High School is designated as a TS & I school in the SWD Sub-Group (425 pupils). PCHS seeks to increase from 35% in 18-19 to 50% in 20-21.

PCHS identifies three core areas of concentration within this description:

- * Student scores on annual state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics
- * Graduation rate
- * Measure of student growth based on the annual assessments

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

PCHS's EPAF Initiative will serve as the most crucial component of monitoring SWD attendance and performance. Weekly meetings with educators who instruct SWD's focus on inclusion and differentiation as the bedrocks for closing achievement gaps in English and math. EPAF compliments the MTSS/RTI cycle for SWD's by adding the teacher voice, student voice, and administrative monitoring to promote and maintain systematic data analysis which, in turn, provides essential, timely feedback to SWD educators. This ongoing, two-way communication among stakeholders adds a safety net for PCHS's SWD's that extends beyond the traditional monitoring of student achievement and seeks to enhance the natural learning environment in areas adjacent to their learning:

- * post-secondary readiness
- * advanced coursework completion
- * school climate.

Additionally, EPAF calls for the monitoring SWD accommodations to ensure they are provided to all students during state assessments and during classroom instruction, classroom assessments, and district assessments. While some instructional accommodations may not be appropriate for use on certain statewide assessments, for example, reading a test to the student may invalidate a reading test, certain accommodations are identified as "standard" or "nonstandard" and may instruct Individualized FSA -like formative assessments in their place for increased potential for success.

Measurable Outcome:

Port Charlotte High School (PCHS) plans to become an "A" school as indicated by the State of Florida's Accountability and Assessment System and seeks to earn 620 points. When this outcome is realized, PCHS will have vaulted from a "C" to an "A." For this growth to occur, PCHS's SWD sub group will increase from 35% in 18-19 to 50% in 20-21, a 15 point jump.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Curtis (paul.curtis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Forged in successful practice and contemplated over time, PCHS's Engaging Pirates in Academic Focus (EPAF) Initiative represents the primary research-based strategy all SWD stakeholders and students will adopt to not only realize the 20-21 goal but also leave a lasting academic impression on the institution and community at large. The 20-21 primary research-based initiative dubbed EPAF, holds this statement as its primary vision: All PCHS stakeholders will rely on standards-based instruction, close monitoring of student performance, and incessant attendance tracking to ensure academic success by engaging

all students in daily academic foci, weekly teacher-made and district-developed formative assessments, and teacher directed feedback to pupils. The inception of EPAF stems from the Ask, Acquire, Appraise, Apply, and Audit evidence cycle.

The strategic plan for implementing EPAF in Math (Algebra I & Geometry), ELA, graduation rate, and attendance for SWD's emanates from a need to install and/or monitor:

A new administrative walk-through tool (The data show...what? Actionable feedback ensues)

Daily standards posted

Daily academic focus posted

Weekly (critical) Bi-weekly (secondary tier) meetings with critical educators

Historic data analysis to drive current practice and learning plans

Rosters – Cusper identification, ESSA, SWD's, ELL's, L25, LG, LF, LY, LA, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3,4,5

Critical Concepts Pacing Guides, Curriculum Maps Monitoring

PACE Cycle - Marzano Elements

Critical Concepts Training

Learning Scales

Ongoing, year-long action plans (artifacts)

Formative assessments (common, team specific, and individual)

ClearSight Platform

Algebra / Geometry Nation workbooks and on line platform

What type of formative assessments (FA) are given?

What will we do with the data acquired from FA's?

How will we measure mastery of the standards?

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

SWD Grades 9/10 EPAF Initiative

In ELA, PCHS SWD's are serviced with EPAF interventions in three teams:

Team Pirate

Teacher A (Reading Endorsed) / Teacher B (Reading Endorsed) / Teacher C(Reading Endorsed) -- All grade 9 and 10 ELA Level 2.1's, 2.2's, and 3.1's (unless attending CTC)

Teacher A -- Three sections of Eng 2 & three sections of AICE EGP (Grade 9) iii

Teacher B -- Three sections of Eng 1, two sections of AICE EGP and 1 section of AICE English Language (grade 10) iii

Teacher C -- Referendum Funded Reading Co-Teach (Push-In, Pull-Out). The Co-Teach will implement a push in / pull out intervention. Daily, students identified as not having met the standards of the week are given iii by the Co-Teach in an alternate setting.

These teachers share students who follow blocked schedules (100 minutes of English/Reading instruction daily)

All three educators have common planning and meet with the APC weekly (EPAF)

Team Red

Teacher A (Reading Endorsed) / Teacher B / Teacher C (Reading Endorsed)

Teacher A / Teacher B have eight sections of ELA Grade 9 or 10 of learning gain levels 1.1, 1.2, 1.3.

Teacher C six sections of Intensive Reading grades 9 and 10 learning gains levels 1.1, 1.2, & 1.3. Teacher A / Teacher B / Teacher C share all grade 9 and 10 1.1's, 1.2's, and a few 1.3's throughout the day. The

students are blocked (100 minutes of English/Reading instruction daily)

The Co-Teach will implement a push in / pull out intervention. Daily, students identified as not having met the standards of the week are given iii by the Co-Teach in an alternate setting.

CD / EBD / ELL Units Individual teams

All EPAF educators meet weekly or bi-weekly.

Interventions include but are not limited to:

Khan Academy, ACT Academy, Achieve 3000, IXL, Airways, Denton, NEPS, Intentional Scheduling

Rethinking timetables (to maximize frequency of teaching and focus on short intensive periods of tuition)

Choosing key skill areas to develop

Focusing on those key skills for the duration of the intervention

Offering daily teaching sessions (or even twice daily sessions)

Assessing students carefully

Using pre and post measures to establish the current level of performance and to monitor progress

Emphasizing short-term, intensive intervention

Seeing students individually, in pairs or in groups of no more than 3

Using evidence-based interventions

Teaching skills to the point of automaticity

Using positive declarations daily

Monitoring and review work

Encouraging students to select and enjoy books and develop a reading for pleasure habit

Offering engaging, accessible and motivating reading material

Linking reading and writing in purposeful and meaningful contexts

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.

1. Back-to-School meetings
 2. Cambridge AICE Night / AP Night / DE Night
 3. College Night
 4. SAC
 5. Automated calls home
 6. Translating all school-home correspondence to target languages Spanish, French, Haitian Creole
 7. Partnering with Sun Newspapers- NIE program (digital and print)
 8. Inviting parents of ELLs to provide input at district ESOL meetings
-
1. Credit retrieval opportunities are offered via the master schedule, night school, Florida Virtual School, Charlotte Virtual School.
 2. The Guidance Department supports students as they entertain alternative education settings such as The Academy, PASS program, Career Quest, SNAP.
 3. Mentoring programs such as Check & Connect, National Honor Society tutoring program, Destination Graduation incentive, Leadership class volunteers.
 4. Summer Work is provided to transitioning students to build an understanding of lessons and parent assistance with school work. In addition, the Guidance Department provides informational meetings for parents and students for school and career planning.
 5. Reaching out to the sending schools' administrative teams to learn how their programs run. Our parental involvement programs will begin where the feeder schools left off, instrumental maintaining support strategies for students and improving parental involvement.
 6. The school tracks and organizes student and teacher data to assist in finding student deficiency areas related to discipline, academic performance, SAT/ACT/PERT performance for college readiness, attendance. Assessments, and recommendations are made by the MTSS team based on performance criteria of struggling 9-12 graders.
 7. Grants are consistently sought to help enrich PD at the school for continuous teacher pedagogical development in assisting students as they transition into high school.
 8. Through MTSS, the school will address student performance indicators of 9th graders by individual instructor to assess need for program/teacher support.
 9. Class of 2023 student and parent "Welcoming Activities" implemented during Freshman Orientation, Open House and the opening weeks of school.
 10. CCPS has adopted policies into the Code of Student Conduct that specifically define bullying and the consequences that follow. PCHS increases awareness of the county policy

by administrative visits to classrooms to review the policy, Pirate TV commercials to remind students to treat each other with respect, and the implementation of anti-bullying program.

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: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00