

Charlotte County Public Schools

Port Charlotte Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 26 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 27 |

Port Charlotte Middle School

23000 MIDWAY BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33952

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/pcm>

Demographics

Principal: Matthew Kunder

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2020-21 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: A (66%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (59%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Charlotte County School Board.

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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 27 |

Port Charlotte Middle School

23000 MIDWAY BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33952

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/pcm>

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| Middle School 6-8 | Yes | 90% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 46% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | A | A | A |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Charlotte County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We empower and inspire all students to be critical thinkers by offering innovative and creative opportunities within our diverse community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Celebrate Success!

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| LeClair, John | Principal | Principal-Co-Chair of PPC, SAC. Responsible for scheduling Professional Development activities requested by the staff. Assist with student discipline interventions and parent conferences. Work with program planners to review grade level data and provide support in the RtI/TST process. Facilitates department PLCs, Oversees instructional intervention programs. |
| Kunder, Matt | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principals-Co-Chair of the SSPPC, member of PTO, Literacy Council. Assist with student discipline interventions and parent conferences. Facilitates the new Teacher PLC and works with teachers on coordinating professional development opportunities. Work with program planners to review grade level data and provide support in the RtI/TST process. |
| Whisenant, Tara | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principals-Co-Chair of the SSPPC, member of PTO, Literacy Council. Assist with student discipline interventions and parent conferences. Facilitates the new Teacher PLC and works with teachers on coordinating professional development opportunities. Work with program planners to review grade level data and provide support in the RtI/TST process. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Matthew Kunder

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

9

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

854

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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 | 255 | 296 | 311 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 862 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 98 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 253 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 53 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 49 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 69 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 78 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 81 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 78 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 90 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 222 |

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 | 3 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 228 | 245 | 205 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 678 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 57 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 58 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 169 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 51 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 40 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

2020-21 - 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 | 228 | 245 | 205 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 678 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 57 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 58 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 169 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 51 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 40 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 56% | 54% | 54% | 53% | 54% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 58% | 53% | 54% | 53% | 55% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 56% | 46% | 47% | 51% | 48% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 71% | 63% | 58% | 66% | 59% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 68% | 61% | 57% | 65% | 57% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 61% | 50% | 51% | 68% | 53% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 64% | 59% | 51% | 64% | 57% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 85% | 78% | 72% | 87% | 80% | 72% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 49% | 1% | 54% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 46% | 3% | 52% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -50% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 56% | 4% | 56% | 4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -49% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 51% | 11% | 55% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 71% | 62% | 9% | 54% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 47% | 11% | 46% | 12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -71% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 55% | 7% | 48% | 14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 71% | -71% | 67% | -67% |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 84% | 78% | 6% | 71% | 13% |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 94% | 64% | 30% | 61% | 33% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 62% | -62% | 57% | -57% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Clearsight for ELA & Math grades 6-8th, IXL for Intensive Reading grades 6-8th, USA Test Prep for 7th grade Civics, USA Test Prep for 8th grade science

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|---------|
| Number/% Proficiency | | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 65/31% | | 74/36% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 36/27% | | 43/34% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/9% | | 5/11% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | | 0/0% |
| Number/% Proficiency | | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 46/24% | 73/33% | 123/53% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 26/22% | 43/32% | 67/47% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6/15% | 6/13% | 12/25% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 1/20% |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 91/39% | | 96/45% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 45/35% | | 44/39% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5/9% | | 10/16% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | | 2/40% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 60/30% | 111/46% | 164/64% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 27/25% | 52/39% | 77/55% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8/15% | 15/25% | 21/32% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 2/50% | 4/67% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Civics | All Students | 47/22% | 116/45% | 143/64% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 22/19% | 54/38% | 64/56% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7/12% | 16/23% | 18/32% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 2/40% | 3/60% |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Number/% Proficiency | | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 90/45% | | 94/48% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43/38% | | 44/41% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7/19% | | 7/18% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | | 0/0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | | Fall | Winter |
| Mathematics | All Students | 61/38% | 119/57% | 149/71% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 29/33% | 57/50% | 77/68% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/11% | 12/31% | 18/47% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 1/20% | 1/17% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | | Fall | Winter |
| Science | All Students | 113/63% | | 39/91% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 57/57% | | 14/88% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 12/32% | | 0/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | | 0/0% |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 32 | 51 | 51 | 44 | 52 | 57 | 37 | 63 | 62 | | |
| ELL | 47 | 66 | 59 | 60 | 63 | 50 | 21 | 80 | | | |
| ASN | 81 | 67 | | 81 | 67 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | 58 | 39 | 51 | 60 | 77 | 47 | 89 | 65 | | |
| HSP | 47 | 59 | 58 | 59 | 62 | 55 | 39 | 74 | 72 | | |
| MUL | 63 | 52 | 58 | 69 | 75 | 67 | 59 | 89 | 88 | | |
| WHT | 51 | 54 | 46 | 63 | 64 | 60 | 65 | 76 | 68 | | |
| FRL | 46 | 52 | 52 | 57 | 60 | 67 | 48 | 73 | 67 | | |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 33 | 57 | 55 | 51 | 66 | 67 | 39 | 69 | 29 | | |
| ELL | 50 | 66 | 63 | 66 | 70 | 63 | | 78 | | | |

| 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 |
| ASN | 81 | 80 | | 95 | 75 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | 60 | 67 | 66 | 82 | 86 | 41 | 89 | 64 | | |
| HSP | 56 | 60 | 53 | 68 | 70 | 57 | 73 | 79 | 76 | | |
| MUL | 59 | 55 | | 71 | 69 | 40 | 67 | 90 | 75 | | |
| WHT | 56 | 56 | 54 | 72 | 63 | 58 | 64 | 85 | 74 | | |
| FRL | 52 | 56 | 51 | 68 | 66 | 65 | 61 | 83 | 67 | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 32 | 46 | 41 | 41 | 52 | 62 | 43 | 70 | 40 | | |
| ELL | 26 | 53 | 50 | 42 | 64 | 67 | | | | | |
| ASN | 100 | 85 | | 92 | 92 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 46 | 57 | 58 | 60 | 64 | 67 | 63 | 94 | 72 | | |
| HSP | 59 | 51 | 44 | 64 | 65 | 74 | 50 | 85 | 73 | | |
| MUL | 54 | 50 | 71 | 73 | 66 | 71 | 40 | 82 | | | |
| WHT | 51 | 53 | 47 | 66 | 64 | 64 | 70 | 85 | 78 | | |
| FRL | 50 | 53 | 48 | 61 | 65 | 68 | 59 | 83 | 68 | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 58 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 33 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 584 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 50 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 53 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 74 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 59 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 55 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 69 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 61 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 58 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

A positive trend has emerged when looking at three year trend data across all reporting categories of ELA Reading on the FSA.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

While there exists a three year positive trend in reading data, it remains an area of focus as it is the lowest area of student performance on the state assessment for Port Charlotte Middle School. A specific area of concern that exists based off the prior year assessment data can be found in the lowest 25% of readers for grade 7 and grade 8. These two areas showed a decrease in relation to performance data from that group in prior years.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The global pandemic that existed during the 2020 school year has had a significant impact on attendance, use of cooperative learning, and school wide initiatives that promote school culture.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

While improvement is difficult to be found in the 2020 school year, the data points that were found in 8th grade math performance in both pre Algebra and Algebra I showed a continuous area of excelling in learning gains and proficiency in all learning gain subgroups.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors that impacted this improvement can be found in the teachers focus on continuous growth in their understanding of the state standards. A new action that was made in this area is that the school added an additional section of intensive math to the 8th grade over that which was offered in the prior year. This additional section allows 22 more students with deficiencies in mathematics to have an extra 50 minutes per day of standards focused math instruction.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In order to accelerate learning, student formative assessment data will need to be used to inform instruction and further improve teacher ability to efficiently meet student needs in mastery of state standards. All math teachers will be continuing to use clearsight as their common formative assessment tool. Formative assessment data will then be collaborated on during common planning

time and department professional learning communities in order to most effectively implement instructional change.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Our lead teacher will continue to provide professional development opportunities related to Canvas, so that teachers can effectively meet the needs of students who are both present, or absent due to Covid 19.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Teachers will continue to work collaboratively through the use of grade level meetings and department based professional learning communities. These collaboration opportunities will provide both new and returning teachers with the venue to discuss most effective ways to meet the unique needs of the students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase ELA Achievement - We dropped 5% in this component compared to 2019 and we believe we can improve 9% so 60% of our students are proficient.

Measurable Outcome: To increase ELA Achievement by 9% so 60% of our students are proficient.

Monitoring: Progress monitoring data and formative assessment analysis will be done by teachers on a consistent basis and discussed collaboratively at department professional learning communities. The formative assessments that will be used for our lowest level readers in our intensive reading classes will be IXL. The formative assessment that will be used for all ELA classes will be from the new adopted SAVVAS instructional materials.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence based strategy that will be used to aligned instruction with the state standards is that all teachers will be using critical concepts.

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

Action Steps to Implement

The Lead Teacher will work with the department chair to determine the professional development needs of the department, and organize professional development opportunities for critical concepts.

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

Teachers will use the critical concepts training and rubrics to continue to create lessons that are built to state standards.

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

Teachers will use appropriate formative assessments (Savvas and IXL) on a consistent basis and collaborate with grade level colleagues to most effectively devise a plan for instructional change.

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

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

Increase Math Lowest 25% Gains - We increased 1% in this component compared to 2019. Our goal is to increase 1% to 63%.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

Our goal is to increase 1% in this area to 63%

Monitoring:

Progress monitoring data and formative assessment analysis will be done by teachers on a consistent basis and discussed collaboratively at department professional learning communities. The formative assessments that will be used for all students will be clear-sight assessments. Teachers will then use this data and collaborate during grade level common planning, to prescribe the most effective course of action to increase student performance.

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Tara Whisenant (tara.whisenant@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

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

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

SIM has proven to be an effective strategy to increase achievement and our students have shown positive gains the last few years. Extra time in math has proven to increase math achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will use SIM strategies at least 4 times a month

**Person
Responsible**

Tara Whisenant (tara.whisenant@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teachers will also focus on differentiated instruction.

**Person
Responsible**

Tara Whisenant (tara.whisenant@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Our APC will continue to schedule intensive math blocks for our struggling math students

**Person
Responsible**

Tara Whisenant (tara.whisenant@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teachers will use Critical Concepts to ensure instruction is aligned to standards.

**Person
Responsible**

Tara Whisenant (tara.whisenant@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teachers will use Clear-sight to monitor progress and provide interventions for students not making adequate

**Person
Responsible**

Tara Whisenant (tara.whisenant@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Common planning will be built into the master schedule to afford time for teacher collaboration on student data.

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

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

Increase ELA Learning Gains - We decreased 2% to 56% compared to 2019 but we would like to increase this component to 60%

**Measurable
Outcome:**

To increase ELA Learning Gains by 4% to 60%

Monitoring:

Progress monitoring data and formative assessment analysis will be done by teachers on a consistent basis and discussed collaboratively at department professional learning communities. The formative assessments that will be used for our lowest level readers in our intensive reading classes will be IXL. The formative assessment that will be used for all ELA classes will be from the new adopted SAVAS instructional materials.

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

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

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

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

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will use the Critical Concepts to focus on the state standards

**Person
Responsible**

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teachers will prescribe IXL to students who struggle mastering the skills necessary to be successful

**Person
Responsible**

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teachers will differentiate instruction to help all learners

**Person
Responsible**

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Use ClearSight to monitor progress of students throughout the year and provide interventions for students not showing adequate progress.

**Person
Responsible**

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Increase number of intensive reading sections by adding 5 more sections.

**Person
Responsible**

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Use Savvas and IXL as formative assessment tools throughout the year.

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

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

Increase ELA Lowest 25% Gains - We decreased 6% in this component and we feel we can increase by 10%

Measurable Outcome:

Our goal is to increase ELA Lowest 25% Gains by 10% to 60%

Monitoring:

Progress monitoring data and formative assessment analysis will be done by teachers on a consistent basis and discussed collaboratively at department professional learning communities. The formative assessments that will be used for our lowest level readers in our intensive reading classes will be IXL. The formative assessment that will be used for all ELA classes will be from the new adopted SAVAS instructional materials.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Action Steps to Implement

Increase the number of intensive reading sections on the master schedule so as to allow more struggling readers to have increased explicit instruction in reading.

Person**Responsible**

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teachers will use critical concepts and embed strategic student vocabulary in lessons throughout the year. This increased usage will be evident in teacher lesson plans and canvas modules.

Person**Responsible**

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Intensive reading teachers will use IXL as a formative assessment on a weekly basis and collaborate with peers on data.

Person**Responsible**

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teachers will monitor the progress of students and continue to differentiate instruction to the needs of all students. This differentiation will be evident on lesson plans.

Person**Responsible**

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

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

Increase ELA Achievement for our Students with Disabilities - We decreased 1% in this component compared to 2019. Our goal is to increase by 3% to 35%.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

Our goal is to increase 3% in this area to 35%

Monitoring:

Progress monitoring data and formative assessment analysis will be done by teachers on a consistent basis and discussed collaboratively at department professional learning communities. The formative assessments that will be used for our lowest level readers in our intensive reading classes will be IXL. The formative assessment that will be used for all ELA classes will be from the new adopted SAVAS instructional materials.

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

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

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

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

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule the lowest 300 students into an intensive reading class.

**Person
Responsible**

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Use weekly formative assessments with all intensive reading classes and analyze student data to inform instructional changes.

**Person
Responsible**

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Provide interventions for students not showing adequate progress compared to their peers. These interventions will include the assistance of our classroom paraprofessionals who can work in groups or with individual students.

**Person
Responsible**

Matt Kunder (matthew.kunder@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

We're ranked #312 out of 553 middle schools. We would like to see more of a downward trend compared to the state and will accomplish this by focusing on more positive behavior and incentives to stay focused on learning. Students can earn Terrier Pride Tickets for positive behavior, which they can turn in for a drawing to win prizes each Friday. Teachers can also enter a drawing each month for making and documenting positive phone calls home. Referral free students can earn a free ticket to the annual student 3 vs 3 basketball tournament. Students can also earn a reward for getting to class on time through our "Pop-up Tardy Reward" program. We will select a Golden Terrier each semester for remaining referral free. We will continue to monitor our discipline data on a monthly basis and make adjustments as needed.

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.

PCMS will continue to invite parents to attend Honor Roll Assemblies with their student. We will also invite them to attend our Family Center events scheduled throughout the year. Parent communication from the school will be through the School Messenger system and Remind App. We will also send out a quarterly Terrier Times Newsletter for parents. We will continue our big family event - Career Night in February. Our new website will be utilized to share important information to our school community and parents.

In the spring, PCMS hosts Sixth Grade Riser Orientation. The fifth grade students and their parents are invited to an orientation at PCMS. Parents are invited to walk the campus, meet teachers, and are given an overview of the school day.

-Guidance counselors and student representatives will visit feeder schools.

-In the month of August, parents and students are invited back to school for an open house symposium.

During

the open house, parents can follow their child's schedule, meet and greet their child's teachers, and hear presentations on the various clubs and activities available to students. Topics for presentations include academic

and behavioral expectations, dress code, schedule changes, etc.

- In the spring, the high school guidance department visits with 8th grade students to review high school course selections and discuss course requirements.
- SAC schedules a parent information session in the spring for 8th grade parents. The high school leadership team is invited to share their school's requirements, course selections, and clubs and activities available to 9th grade students with them.
- We will continue involving students in creating a positive culture through the Kindness Club. This club will create activities that encourage positive interactions and kindness.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Port Charlotte Middle School recognizes the importance of parent and family engagement in order to successfully educate our students. Our goal for this upcoming school year is to improve the relationship with parents and families. We would also like to provide more opportunities for parents/families to be involved in the education of their child. In addition to holding Parent and Family Engagement Committee meetings, virtually, once a month, the committee will attend all PFEP county trainings. We will also encourage family involvement through the PTO and SAC meetings. Staff members will take an active role in encouraging students to be kind to others.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |