

Charlotte County Public Schools

Charlotte Harbor School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Charlotte Harbor School

22450 HANCOCK AVE, Port Charlotte, FL 33980

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/chc>

Demographics

Principal: Herb Bennett

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special 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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Charlotte Harbor School

22450 HANCOCK AVE, Port Charlotte, FL 33980

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/chc>

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)
Combination School PK-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

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 strive to educate students and to assist them in realizing their full potential as responsible, productive, contributing members of society by providing an educational environment in which students are challenged, excellence is expected, and differences are valued.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Reaching our potential.

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
Bennett, Herb	Principal	Conducts classroom walk-throughs and teacher and para observations, and manages student, parent and staff needs and concerns.
Arritt, Jon	Assistant Principal	Conducts classroom walk-throughs and teacher and para observations, and manages student, parent and staff needs and concerns.
Wood, Sandra	Other	Oversees student behaviors, is responsible for writing student behavior plans, assists in staff assistance calls, and trains staff for CBI training.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/10/2020, Herb Bennett

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.*

16

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special 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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	5	5	23	11	7	7	10	12	19	10	6	7	23	145	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	5	3	0	1	2	3	5	2	2	0	24	
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	3	2	5	3	4	5	4	4	1	2	36	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3	4	3	1	0	0	18	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	8	1	5	3	4	32	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	5	9	1	0	0	0	26	

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	2	0	3	4	4	5	3	6	5	3	2	0	0	37

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	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	1	10	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/17/2020

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	2	7	14	10	7	6	9	9	22	11	8	5	27	137	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	6	7	3	3	3	2	9	7	4	2	7	54	
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	10	6	2	1	1	42	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	6	3	1	0	1	16	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	8	

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	1	2	4	3	3	3	10	6	3	1	1	37	

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	2	12
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	2	7	14	10	7	6	9	9	22	11	8	5	27	137
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	6	7	3	3	3	2	9	7	4	2	7	54
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	10	6	2	1	1	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	6	3	1	0	1	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	8

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	1	2	4	3	3	3	10	6	3	1	1	37

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	2	12
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	0%	65%	61%	0%	70%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	49%	59%	0%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	46%	54%	0%	0%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	60%	62%	0%	50%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	43%	59%	0%	51%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	35%	52%	0%	0%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	60%	56%	0%	67%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	75%	78%	0%	67%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	69%	-69%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	49%	-49%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	46%	-46%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	55%	56%	-1%	56%	-1%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		55%				
Cohort Comparison		55%				
09	2019	0%	53%	-53%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	70%	-70%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	69%	-69%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	60%	-60%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	56%	-56%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	46%	-46%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	64%	-64%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	80%	47%	33%	46%	34%
	2018	0%	45%	-45%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		80%				
Cohort Comparison		80%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	55%	-55%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	0%	78%	-78%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	78%	-78%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	76%	-76%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	75%	-75%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	72%	-72%	62%	-62%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%

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	35	58		39	49		17	29		45	
BLK	50			42	40						
WHT	33	53		44	56		20	40			
FRL	36	68		44	58		17				
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	264
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	41
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.

Science showed the lowest level of performance with 60% of students at a Level 1, and no students higher than a Level 3. This decline is believed to be largely connected to poor test preparation and motivation.

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

Science showed the most significant decline with 38% of students at Level 1 three years prior, to 60% at Level 1 two years. This decline is believed to be largely connected to poor test preparation and motivation.

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.

Science has the highest achievement gap with 43.3% more students at Level 1 than the state average. This decline is believed to be largely connected to poor test preparation and motivation.

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

ELA has the highest achievement gains with Level 4 students increasing 7.3% and Level 1 students decreasing by 19.6%. Improving grades in 6th grade ELA was one of the goals from last years School Improvement Plan. It included collecting I-ready data, progress reports every 9 weeks, bi-weekly meetings with 6th graders to review their progress and discussions of academic shortfalls at MTSS meetings.

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

In terms of academics, Science showed the most room for growth. Social Studies also showed some room for growth as well with 29.4% of students at Level 1 and 41.2% of students at Level 2.

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

1. Science Performance
2. Social Studies Performance
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Comparing the levels of academic achievement in Science from the two previous school years show it to be the only subject that had a major decline in student success. The amount of Level 1 students increased from 38.9% to 60%. It is also the only subject area to have no student above a Level 3.

Measurable Outcome: Increase in Biology Scores by 40%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Herb Bennett (herb.bennett@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring will be done through bi-weekly reviews of student performance in Biology.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale behind the following strategies is that active monitoring of student progress can show us what students are making academic gains in Biology. If the data shows certain students are struggling to improve, we can look at what accommodations can be provided through their IEP or what alternative instructional methods can be used to help them make progress.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Progress reports are updated every 9 weeks and are reviewed by administration and school liaison.
2. Academic student shortfalls based on data will be reviewed in MTSS meetings held by Mr. Arritt.
3. Implementation of IEP accommodations will be implemented by teachers and monitored by the school liaison quarterly.
4. Teachers will meet with students bi-weekly to review progress monitoring results.
5. Students will analyze their scores, then set a goal of improving a minimum of one level.
6. Teachers will check in with students to help track progress toward meeting their goal.

Person Responsible: Daniel Melvin (daniel.melvin@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	All of the students at Charlotte Harbor Center are identified as Students with Disabilities. It is also the only subgroup that was identified as needing to be helped in the data.
Measurable Outcome:	All behavior plans that have been outdated for five or more years will be updated. Students that do not currently have a behavior plan from where they were transitioned shall have behavior plans created for them.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Herb Bennett (herb.bennett@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Update Behavior Intervention Plans for students that are identified as being outdated by five years or more, as well as create new behavior plans for those that did not have them.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Behavior Intervention Plans of several students are outdated or have not yet been created. These plans are necessary to help modify student behavior in the classroom, which is essential for academic success and developing a positive school culture. By updating them, we can assure that each student gets their individual needs met.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students without behavior plans and who have had behavior plans outdated for more than five years will be identified.
2. Data will be collected over the course of the year by the behavior specialist(s) using data collection sheets, behavior referrals, and maladaptives in Focus.
3. Progress Reports will be written every 9 weeks and reviewed by the liaison.
4. Behavior Specialists will consult with teachers on what strategies are necessary.
5. Behavior Implementation Plans will be updated and shared with teachers and necessary staff.

Person Responsible Sandra Wood (sandra.wood@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: The graduation rate for Charlotte Harbor School is below the 67% identified as necessary by the ESSA data. As a result, it is an area in which improvement is needed to ensure students graduate with a diploma.

Measurable Outcome: All students that are getting ready to graduate this school year will graduate with all the credits necessary to get their diploma.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Herb Bennett (herb.bennett@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring of students expected to graduate.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By monitoring the progress of students that are getting ready to graduate, staff can make sure that they are successful in their academics and will successfully graduate. The data can also identify those graduates that are struggling and provide them with the necessary accommodations or alternative teaching methods that will help them succeed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Progress reports are updated every 9 weeks and are reviewed by administration and school liaison.
2. Academic student shortfalls based on data will be reviewed in MTSS meetings held by Mr. Arritt.
3. Implementation of IEP accommodations will be implemented by teachers and monitored by the school liaison quarterly.
4. Teachers will meet with students bi-weekly to review academic grades.
5. Teachers will check in with students to help track progress toward meeting their goal.

Person Responsible Jon Arritt (jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All identified areas are addressed.

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.

Charlotte Harbor Center has re-established the PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention and Support) team to promote a positive school culture and environment. Some of the innovations being done by PBIS include:

1. Expanding the use of school store to West Campus through the use of "gift cards" that students can earn.
2. Providing posters for every classroom that encourage positive behavior and goals.
3. Providing students with journals they can request access to twice a day that they can use to express their emotions and concerns.
4. Providing teacher with a template for Behavior Contracts that they can use to motivate student behavior in the classroom.
5. Creating a Powerpoint presentation to teach staff school expectations and procedures, and providing copies to staff members for reference and consistency.

Several behavior strategies were also implemented prior to the reintroduction of PBIS including:

1. The use of a cool down room for students who are frustrated.
2. In class breaks and additional support staff.
3. A school store used initially by SANDS students.
4. Weekly MTSS and SAT meeting to discuss student achievement and behavior.
5. Staff shout-outs and student shout-outs to show appreciation for hard work and making good choices.

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: Science	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00