

Charlotte County Public Schools

The Academy



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	22

The Academy

18300 COCHRAN BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33948

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/acad>

Demographics

Principal: Deshon Jenkins

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* 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	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

The Academy

18300 COCHRAN BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33948

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/acad>

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 6-12	Yes	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative 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.

To provide a unique, caring, and flexible learning environment that motivates students to take charge of their future success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Academy's vision is to help students graduate from high school prepared to transition into a post secondary pathway as a prepared citizen 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
Ham, Jack	Principal	Instructional leader to all subjects areas Master Scheduling Data Analysis Textbook Manager Facilities Activities Community advocacy committee Finance and Budgeting Crisis Management Data Entry RTI/MTSS coordinators PPC PBIS SAT Supervise all drop out prevention programs
Farnsworth, Michele	Teacher, ESE	ESE Liaison Faciliate IEP meetings and Implement IEP's IEP Compliance Provide training on accommodations and IEP access to teachers MTSS Coordinator Provide Standardized Testing Support to Test Coordinator Provide strategies and interventions to struggling students and ESE students Provide Consultative Services to teachers and students Parent Liaison to families with students with disabilities Provide and initiate directives from DOE regarding students with disabilities Provide behavioral supports and consult to students with behavioral/ disciplinary incidents Complete and implement transfer IEP's for transfer students Meet with ESE students regulary for progress montitoring and post-secondary planning
Greenwood, Rebecca	Dean	Student Discipline SAC
Blanchette, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Professional Development Coordinator Parent involvement

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Deshon Jenkins

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

0

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

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	24	18	26	62	85	221	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	8	9	26	56	117	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	8	10	26	31	93	

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	4	0	0	1	18	23	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/18/2020

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	1	9	28	8	30	56	95	227	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	3	15	23	46	106	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	2	14	22	24	75	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	21	5	21	30	46	130	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	2	8	22	41	89	

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	1	6	21	5	22	36	58	149

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	16	22	
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	1	9	28	8	30	56	95	227	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	3	15	23	46	106	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	2	14	22	24	75	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	21	5	21	30	46	130	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	2	8	22	41	89	

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	1	6	21	5	22	36	58	149

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	16	22	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	

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%	62%	56%	0%	61%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	54%	51%	0%	55%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	45%	42%	0%	50%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	64%	51%	0%	64%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	56%	48%	0%	51%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	45%	0%	47%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	72%	68%	0%	78%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	73%	0%	78%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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
06	2019	0%	49%	-49%	54%	-54%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	46%	-46%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	13%	56%	-43%	56%	-43%
	2018	7%	57%	-50%	58%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
09	2019	6%	53%	-47%	55%	-49%
	2018	12%	53%	-41%	53%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
10	2019	7%	52%	-45%	53%	-46%
	2018	17%	53%	-36%	53%	-36%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	64%	-64%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	47%	-47%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	45%	-45%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	38%	71%	-33%	67%	-29%
2018	23%	69%	-46%	65%	-42%
Compare		15%			
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	48%	76%	-28%	70%	-22%
2018	37%	75%	-38%	68%	-31%
Compare		11%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	10%	64%	-54%	61%	-51%
2018	5%	72%	-67%	62%	-57%
Compare		5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	21%	62%	-41%	57%	-36%
2018	9%	60%	-51%	56%	-47%
Compare		12%			

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								25		55	4
HSP										32	
WHT	10	29		7	25		35	29		47	5
FRL	5	22			27		33	15		44	2
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	18
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	146
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	75%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	32
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	23
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	19
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

Economically Disadvantaged Students - 19% proficient
 100% of our student population falls into this category based on CEP data
 -Lack of Instructional coach that would have provided curriculum and instructional support to classroom teachers
 -Ineffective progress monitoring
 -No curriculum guides to support block schedule

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

Economically Disadvantaged dropped by 7% in ELA gains from 29% to 22%.
 100% of our student population falls into this category based on CEP data
 -Lack of Instructional coach that would have provided curriculum and instructional support to classroom teachers
 -Ineffective progress monitoring
 -No curriculum guides to support block schedule
 -Collaborative planning was not put in place with fidelity

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.

Students with Disabilities: There was 16% gap between SWD's achievement in ELA. The state average is 36% and our SWD's was 20%. Our school also has a 34% SWD population. Contributing factors include: students were already academically behind before enrolling in The Academy. Insufficient time allocated to interventions and strategy-based implementation.

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

Graduation rate jumped to 44.7%, an increase of 9.4%

We did offer make-up days for testing, offered SAT during the school day, offered PERT during the school day, offered test-taking strategy sessions during the school day, as well as Khan Academy remedial instruction.

School leadership and some staff attended the Simon Youth Foundation conference on drop out prevention

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

1. Level 1 scores on 2020 statewide ELA assessment
2. Level 1 scores on 2020 statewide math assessment

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

1. Reduce the number of level 1 scores on 2020 statewide ELA assessment
2. Reduce the number of level 1 on 2020 statewide math assessment
3. Test 90% or higher of student population on all state assessments
4. Increase our cohort graduation rate
5. Increase average daily attendance rate for all subgroups

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The Academy's economically disadvantaged population is 100% based on CEP data. Being a majority of the students we serve, it is critical we implement all evidence-based strategies to support the academic growth of this ESSA subgroup. The Federal Index for the Economically Disadvantaged Students at The Academy is 19%.

Measurable Outcome: The Academy will show a 5% reduction in ELA and math State level 1 scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jack Ham (jack.ham@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: -collaborative planning - department-based focusing on math and ELA standards
-Department Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) focused on use of curriculum maps and pacing guides to support the block schedule
-progress monitoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative planning is a commonly used strategy in several high performing districts like Sarasota and St. John's and is identified as a best practice by school leaders in both counties. Evidence level 3.
Professional Learning Communities are cited by the Institute of Educational Sciences as an effective means of facilitating ongoing job-embedded professional development and discourse. Evidence level 3.
Progress Monitoring- USA Test Prep and IXL have provided correlational evidence between success on progress monitoring assessments and achievement on statewide standardized assessments. Evidence level 3.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLC's -department heads will facilitate monthly PLC meetings to determine essential state standards that will support students' areas of weakness in order to close the achievement gaps in learning.

Person Responsible Jack Ham (jack.ham@yourcharlotteschools.net)

2. Progress monitoring - The Academy is taking a layered approach to progress monitoring encompassing 3 major components: Progress monitoring for math and ELA will be scheduled through ClearSight twice per semester. Progress monitoring for science and social studies will be scheduled through USA Test Prep twice per semester. This data will be analyzed after each progress monitoring window by teachers, with the support of the lead teacher in order to guide instruction, remediation and interventions. In addition to progress monitoring, student classroom progress reports (based on course grades) will be printed and distributed to students every three weeks by the school's data technician. The MTSS team will meet every three weeks to review student data and select interventions to be implemented to support students who have grades below a C, attendance below 80%, and/or behavior concerns.

Person Responsible Jack Ham (jack.ham@yourcharlotteschools.net)

3. Testing awareness (for students) - Teachers will meet with students individually to review student's most recent state assessment results. Teachers and students will analyze their scores, determine their areas of strength and weakness, then set a goal of improving a minimum of one level. Teachers will conduct check-ins with students to help them track their progress toward meeting their goals.

Person Responsible Jack Ham (jack.ham@yourcharlotteschools.net)

4. All teachers will be provided with rosters of students which identifies each students subgroup, and their FSA sub-levels. This will allow teachers to provide tiered support to students in the identified CS&I subgroups: SWD, Hispanic, white, and ED.

Person Responsible Jack Ham (jack.ham@yourcharlotteschools.net)

5. Use of materials that are aligned to the state standards and:

-can be differentiated to the needs of the learners

-are rigorous

-are high interest

Person Responsible Jack Ham (jack.ham@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The Academy's economically disadvantaged population is 100% based on CEP data. Being a majority of the students we serve, it is critical we implement all evidence-based strategies to support the academic growth of this ESSA subgroup. Students need diplomas in order to transition and plan for post secondary options.

Measurable Outcome: The Academy will increase its graduation rate 6%, from 44% to 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jack Ham (jack.ham@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: MTSS
PBIS

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: MTSS and PBIS are required under IDEA and are implemented in over 25,000 schools in the United States. PBIS is a research driven holistic approach to behavior and discipline that impacts student achievement by keeping students in school, teaching positive behaviors, and reinforcing positive behavior to promote ongoing success. It relates to graduation rates, student performance, and closing the achievement gap as attendance is one of the highest correlated indicators to achievement. Evidence Level 2.

Action Steps to Implement

1. MTSS - The MTSS team will meet bi-weekly to review student data including grades, attendance, and behavior in order to implement and track the success of tiered interventions. Priority will be given to students who fall within the CS&I subgroups: SWD, Hispanic, white, ED.

Person Responsible Jack Ham (jack.ham@yourcharlotteschools.net)

2. Student guided credit checks- the guidance counselor will meet with every class during the first quarter to guide students through a thorough credit check of their transcripts. This process will ensure students are on track with their credits earned towards completion of high school requirements and on-time graduation with their cohort.

Person Responsible Jack Ham (jack.ham@yourcharlotteschools.net)

3. Testing awareness/concordant testing opportunities- the guidance counselor will generate a list of students for upcoming state testing, distribute the list to teachers, who will remind students each class period of their testing date, time, and location. Testing sessions will be promoted through flyers displayed around school to encourage participation and attendance of students.

Person Responsible Jack Ham (jack.ham@yourcharlotteschools.net)

4. PBIS - to overcome the barrier of poor attendance, the PBIS team will focus on encouraging students to attain an attendance rate of 80% or higher through use of daily, monthly, and quarterly student recognition.

Person Responsible Jack Ham (jack.ham@yourcharlotteschools.net)

5. Parent involvement: To keep parents informed about their child's progress towards graduation, The Academy will utilize parent/teacher conferences (as needed/requested) along with informational sessions, "Senior Night" (held twice a year) about graduation requirements.

Person Responsible Jack Ham (jack.ham@yourcharlotteschools.net)

6. Use of materials that are aligned to the state standards and:
 -can be differentiated to the needs of the learners-
 -are rigorous
 -are high interest

Person Responsible Jack Ham (jack.ham@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The remaining school-wide improvement priorities identified in our Needs Assessment/Analysis have been addressed throughout our areas of focus.

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.

Creating a positive school culture and environment requires all stakeholders are involved. At The Academy, we ensure this is facilitated through positive relationships with parents and families which begins at our interview process. Parents are present when students interview for an opportunity to attend our school. This one-on-one time with the principal allows parents to ask any questions about our school and establish a positive rapport with administration. Through a required orientation process, students and families are introduced to the culture, expectations, and the mission of The Academy with the intention of building a solid foundation to support the needs of students. Families are also provided an overview of the year's activities and opportunities for involvement in family engagement activities and our School Advisory Council (SAC).

To establish positive community relationships, The Academy has 4 post secondary pathway liaisons: military, workforce, college, and technical school. These liaisons introduce community members to our mission, culture, and expectations, allowing the community to understand the unique needs of our students and assist with providing resources and opportunities to support their needs.

A quarterly school newsletter is published to highlight the positive accomplishments of The Academy students and staff. This newsletter is made available to students, families, and community stakeholders in print and electronic format. Additionally, The Academy tracks students' academic and behavioral progress, along with attendance, and communicates the success and challenges with families on a regular basis through phone calls and emails in order to support the continued needs of students.

Our school promotes our family/school/community stakeholder relationships. The lead teacher will be responsible for organizing Title One events throughout the year. Resources to support the school's mission and the needs of our students will be gathered and disseminated through multiple platforms.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00