

Charlotte County Public Schools

# Charlotte High School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>26</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>27</b> |

# Charlotte High School

1250 COOPER ST, Punta Gorda, FL 33950

<http://chs.yourcharlotteschools.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Angie Taillon**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2014

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 89%   |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (59%)<br>2017-18: B (56%)<br>2016-17: B (56%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   |   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |   |

\* 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>27</b> |

## Charlotte High School

1250 COOPER ST, Punta Gorda, FL 33950

<http://chs.yourcharlotteschools.net/>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School<br>9-12                              | No                     | 49%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 34%  |

### School Grades History

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

### 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.**

Be a Learner, Be a Leader, Be a Tarpon!

Be a Learner.....ever-learning, every moment of time, everywhere, and under all circumstances. We learn by working hard at school and always doing our best.

Be a Leader....Lead your own life, be a strong example for others, live by principles, and be an influence for good. Self-leadership is doing the right thing even when no one is looking.

Be a Tarpon.....Promote our Tarpon culture, reinforce our Tarpon fundamentals, and model high expectations for ourselves and others.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our vision is "Tarpons have MOJO" which stands for: Motivation for Success, Ownership of our actions, Journeys through education, and Optimism for the future. We continue to promote a culture where Tarpons do their best, do what is right and treat others the way they wish to be treated.

### 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  |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Corsaletti, Cathy | Principal           | Working together to create an engaging school climate that accelerates student learning is common sense. Each person in the partnership takes an active role and is accountable for effectively completing their individual responsibilities. The principal, along with each AP, oversees a specific department and works together to ensure that standards based instruction is taking place. With each working with a different department we are able to collaborate on strengths and weaknesses within our school. Principal duties include budget, media contact, finance, both internal and district funds, leave requests, SAC and supplements. The Principal works with all AP's to promote our common vision. |
| Damico, Jeff      | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal for curriculum work closely with guidance to develop a master schedule designed to give students the most flexibility for success. Duties also include the Career Center, oversees department chairs, textbooks, and academic awards.  |
| Brown, Nick       | Assistant Principal | This assistant principal oversees technology and all state testing. Duties include data reports, Literacy Committee, Professional Development for staff, NET teachers new to CHS, surveys, and technology usage and orders.  |
| Pyle, Kathryn     | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal for discipline works closely with the deans to ensure student safety, monitors early warning signals for those students in need, and implements the MTSS process. Duties include monitoring attendance, ESE, paraprofessionals, PBiS, School Resource Officers, Deans, registration, and Threat Assessment team.   |
| Tenney, Andrew    | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal for activities works with his team to provide students opportunities to build relationships with others and participate in our positive school culture outside of the classroom. Duties include administrative coverage, security details, capital outlay, custodians, crisis plans, facility work orders, keys, and parking.  |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 8/13/2014, Angie Taillon

**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.*

3



**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.*

10

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

87

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,944

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

4

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

10

### 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 507 | 532 | 478 | 456 | 1973 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 | 135 | 132 | 131 | 529  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77  | 78  | 70  | 50  | 275  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 129 | 144 | 98  | 480  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 139 | 172 | 155 | 591  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 134 | 107 | 111 | 463  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83  | 61  | 62  | 45  | 251  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 134 | 107 | 111 | 463  |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |     |     | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  |     |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 | 165 | 156 | 149 | 617 |       |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 8/13/2021

## 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 447 | 467 | 429 | 450 | 1793  |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60  | 78  | 60  | 80  | 278   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46  | 36  | 31  | 23  | 136   |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 167 | 140 | 130 | 581   |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 123 | 91  | 124 | 459   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89  | 112 | 97  | 78  | 376   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3   | 18  | 83  | 82  | 186   |
|   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |       |

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

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

## 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 447 | 467 | 429 | 450 | 1793 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60  | 78  | 60  | 80  | 278  |       |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46  | 36  | 31  | 23  | 136  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 167 | 140 | 130 | 581  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 123 | 91  | 124 | 459  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89  | 112 | 97  | 78  | 376  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3   | 18  | 83  | 82  | 186  |       |
|   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |      |       |

#### 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 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |    |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 11 | 12 |       |

## 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             |        |          |       | 51%    | 62%      | 56%   | 50%    | 62%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 50%    | 54%      | 51%   | 50%    | 57%      | 53%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 35%    | 45%      | 42%   | 41%    | 47%      | 44%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 54%    | 64%      | 51%   | 54%    | 67%      | 51%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 51%    | 56%      | 48%   | 43%    | 59%      | 48%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 53%    | 52%      | 45%   | 42%    | 57%      | 45%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 71%    | 72%      | 68%   | 68%    | 74%      | 67%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       | 78%    | 80%      | 73%   | 75%    | 80%      | 71%   |

### 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 |
| 09                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 50%    | 53%      | -3%                        | 55%   | -5%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 10                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 49%    | 52%      | -3%                        | 53%   | -4%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -50%   |          |                            |       |                         |

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

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

| BIOLOGY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 72%    | 71%      | 1%                    | 67%   | 5%                 |
| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 81%    | 76%      | 5%                    | 70%   | 11%                |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 45%    | 64%      | -19%                  | 61%   | -16%               |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |

| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 60%    | 62%      | -2%                   | 57%   | 3%                 |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Clearsight, USA Test Prep

| Grade 9               |                            |        |         |         |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|---------|---------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter  | Spring  |
|                       | All Students               | -      | 107/32% | 103/29% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | -      | 47/28%  | 45/26%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | -      | 6/10%   | 8/11%   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | -      | 0/0%    | 0/0%    |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter  | Spring  |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 66/28% | 128/50% | 68/52%  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 30/27% | 56/51%  | 28/49%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 9/36%  | 9/38%   | 3/43%   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | -      | -       | -       |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter  | Spring  |
|                       | All Students               | 67/75% | 86/95%  | -       |
| Biology               | Economically Disadvantaged | 22/69% | 31/89%  | -       |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 1/100% | 1/100%  | -       |
|                       | English Language Learners  | -      | -       | -       |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter  | Spring  |
|                       | All Students               | -      | 0/0%    | 0/0%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | -      | 0/0%    | 0/0%    |
| US History            | Students With Disabilities | -      | -       | -       |
|                       | English Language Learners  | -      | -       | -       |

| Grade 10              |                            |        |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | -      | 80/26% | 94/34% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | -      | 34/22% | 37/26% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | -      | 2/7%   | 3/7%   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | -      | -      | 1/100% |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 28/18% | 54/30% | 22/36% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 16/17% | 33/29% | 5/21%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 8/25%  | 11/28% | 2/22%  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 1/20%  | 14%    | -      |
| Biology               | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 9/39%  | 24/73% | -      |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 5/83%  | 8/73%  | -      |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | -      | -      | -      |
|                       | English Language Learners  | -      | 0/0%   | -      |
| US History            | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 4/80%  | 6/100% | 4/67%  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 1/50%  | 1/100% | 1/50%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 1/100% | 2/100% | 1/100% |
|                       | English Language Learners  | -      | -      | -      |

| Grade 11              |                            |        |         |         |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|---------|---------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter  | Spring  |
|                       | All Students               | -      | 2/10%   | 22/12%  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | -      | 1/10%   | 11/12%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | -      | 0/0%    | 0/0%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | -      | -       | 0/0%    |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter  | Spring  |
|                       | All Students               | 27/18% | 54/30%  | 22/36%  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 16/17% | 33/29%  | 5/21%   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 8/25%  | 11/28%  | 2/22%   |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 1/20%  | 14%     | -       |
| Biology               | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter  | Spring  |
|                       | All Students               | 29/28% | 82/40%  | -       |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 16/29% | 39/36%  | -       |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 2/11%  | 7/20%   | -       |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0/0%   | 1/8%    | -       |
| US History            | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall   | Winter  | Spring  |
|                       | All Students               | 78/28% | 186/69% | 118/74% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 29/23% | 85/64%  | 52/68%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 4/13%  | 26/62%  | 14/56%  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0/0%   | 2/18%   | 1/17%   |

| Grade 12              |                            |       |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | -     | 2/5%   | 25/20% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | -     | 1/5%   | 11/20% |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | -     | 0/0%   | 5/16%  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | -     | -      | 0/0%   |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 6/6%  | 12/11% | 15/17% |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 4/8%  | 6/11%  | 6/16%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 2/8%  | 2/7%   | 2/10%  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0/0%  | 1/25%  | 0/0%   |
| Biology               | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 0/0%  | 1/20%  | -      |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 0/0%  | 1/33%  | -      |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0/0%  | 1/25%  | -      |
|                       | English Language Learners  | -     | -      | -      |
| US History            | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 5/38% | 8/80%  | 2/67%  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 3/43% | 3/100% | 0/0%   |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0/0%  | 6/67%  | 1/100% |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0/0%  | 1/100% | -      |

## 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                                       | 31       | 50     | 44          | 28        | 32      | 25           | 37       | 45      |           | 97                | 35                  |
| ELL                                       | 13       | 35     | 44          | 22        | 40      |              | 20       |         |           | 95                | 22                  |
| ASN                                       | 79       | 69     |             | 91        | 60      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 49       | 54     | 60          | 25        | 24      | 40           | 35       | 61      |           | 98                | 47                  |
| HSP                                       | 43       | 47     | 27          | 42        | 32      | 35           | 54       | 54      |           | 93                | 58                  |



| 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 |
| MUL                                       | 40       | 46     |             | 46        | 26      |              | 70       | 91      |           | 100               | 77                  |
| WHT                                       | 47       | 45     | 46          | 46        | 37      | 24           | 68       | 70      |           | 95                | 66                  |
| FRL                                       | 39       | 42     | 34          | 41        | 36      | 31           | 55       | 63      |           | 93                | 52                  |
| 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                                       | 22       | 35     | 26          | 31        | 52      | 58           | 48       | 61      |           | 89                | 19                  |
| ELL                                       | 35       | 50     | 37          | 31        |         |              | 33       | 45      |           | 77                | 30                  |
| ASN                                       | 64       | 46     |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 42       | 37     | 16          | 43        | 46      | 50           | 60       | 59      |           | 96                | 30                  |
| HSP                                       | 47       | 50     | 41          | 55        | 57      | 65           | 62       | 75      |           | 91                | 47                  |
| MUL                                       | 42       | 41     | 43          | 46        | 37      |              | 71       | 65      |           | 94                | 47                  |
| WHT                                       | 53       | 52     | 37          | 57        | 53      | 55           | 74       | 82      |           | 95                | 52                  |
| FRL                                       | 45       | 45     | 34          | 49        | 49      | 58           | 65       | 72      |           | 93                | 42                  |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 21       | 42     | 32          | 33        | 35      | 33           | 46       | 55      |           | 79                | 24                  |
| ELL                                       | 33       | 31     | 18          |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 83       | 69     |             | 67        | 45      |              | 80       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 32       | 40     | 32          | 44        | 35      |              | 56       | 61      |           | 86                | 32                  |
| HSP                                       | 40       | 43     | 41          | 52        | 46      | 53           | 48       | 68      |           | 87                | 44                  |
| MUL                                       | 53       | 56     |             | 60        | 63      |              | 80       | 67      |           | 79                | 55                  |
| WHT                                       | 53       | 52     | 42          | 55        | 42      | 38           | 72       | 78      |           | 92                | 52                  |
| FRL                                       | 44       | 48     | 43          | 48        | 42      | 42           | 60       | 66      |           | 84                | 37                  |

### 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  | 54  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 56  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 589 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 11  |
| Percent Tested  | 94% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 42  |
| 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                                      | 38  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| 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   | 75  |
| 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                                | 49  |
| 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  | 49  |
| 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   | 62  |
| 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   | 54 |
| 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                                | 47 |
| 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?

ELA lowest 25% made learning gains from 35% - 43%, Math achievement dropped from 55% - 45%. Algebra 1 proficiency had the largest drop from 53% - 28%.

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

The lowest performance in 2019 was ELA 10th Grade proficiency. As a cohort, the students did increase by 3%, however the overall proficiency declined.

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

We believe one of the main factors is the students endurance to complete the test. Many are not motivated and give up right away.

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

The most improved area in 2019 was the math lowest 25%.

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

We provided afterschool math tutoring, an Algebra 1 Boot Camp prior to the EOC, and supplemented instruction with Algebra Nation, XL Math, and Khan Academy.

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

Additional teachers through ESSER funds which will lower class size in Math and English / Reading courses which will provide intensive interventions. Students that are identified with one or more Early Warning Systems will be intentionally scheduled in classes for additional support (Personal Career School Development/with lower numbers for 9th/10th grade). Additional progress monitoring. Teachers in the PCSD classes will meet with students individually on weekly basis to monitor student

grades, test preparation, and classwork completion. Teachers will work with students to create individual goals, increase organization and study skills, and implement the 7 habits into their daily school routine. Continue to provide PLC opportunities in core subject areas. Algebra 1 teachers have a common planning period to develop lessons, common exams, and EOC preparation. Science teachers have a common lunch period for PLC purposes to discuss student and academic progress and achievement, curriculum and standards pacing, and daily issues in the Science department. The English department is divided into a Reading and English department. Both departments are working with the district Curriculum and Instruction specialist, Heather Garcia, to be trained on the new BEST standards as well as Canvas. Our Reading department (all reading endorsed teachers with Level 1 students) will meet on a weekly basis to accelerate the learning of those students. The Social Studies department will meet with the district Curriculum and Instruction specialist, Donna Dunakey, to implement an extra (4th) progress monitoring window that will tie in with the districts critical concepts.

**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.**

Ongoing training for English teachers with the new textbooks tied to the new BEST standards. Guest speaker to provide strategies for project-based lessons.

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

The extra ESSER position(s) will ensure sustainability of improvement and will include: An additional social worker, additional teachers in critical core areas (Algebra 1 (A), Intensive Reading, English 1 (level 1 proficient students) (currently funded only for the 2021-22 SY), and continued renewal of supportive software programs IXL and StudySync (funded until the 2022-23 SY).

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Overall, in 2019 we had a decrease from 41% to 35% in our lowest 25% gains. Our focus was to increase the gains of our lowest 25% and data from 2021 indicates we improved from 35% to 43% in this area. We will continue to focus on ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25% in 2021-22 as well as proficiency and learning gains.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Our goal last year was to improve our ELA Lowest 25% learning gains by 7% and we met that goal by increasing 8%. Our goal is to build upon that success and increase our ELA Lowest 25% learning gains by another 2%, increase proficiency and learning gains by 3%.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | We will use the MY Access! program along with our Literacy Initiative. Several reports are available to monitor progress. MY Access! is an award-winning research based, online writing instruction and assessment platform that facilitates student writing proficiency by providing immediate scores and adaptive feedback. MY Access! improves student writing by engaging students in the recursive process of revision, and empowers teachers to focus on differentiated instruction and intervention.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | We will continue our school-wide literacy-based initiative (year 5 of implementation). Prior data will be used as evidence.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Literacy is the essential foundation of education. The goal of the literacy initiative is to equip our students with literacy skills that prepare our students to be college and career ready. In 20-21 we had 1544 students that completed submissions and a total of 14,643 submissions for an average of 9.48 submissions per student. We had 81 teachers who created assignments. On average we saw a 3.13% growth from the first submission to the final submission for each assignment. For literacy, teachers were instructed to use the 4 point rubric. On the 4 point rubric, there was a total of 11,303 submissions from 1,461 students for an average of 7.73 submissions. When you factor in students with CTC, FSW, and OJT, this shows high compliance of teachers requiring students to complete a revision. On the 4 point rubric, we saw an average growth percentage of 3.24%. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

For our August PD school day, we had a guest speaker, Trevor Muir, motivate our staff with a variety of educational topics including ways to accelerate learning and engage students through project-based learning and story telling. General ideas and topics were discussed, but in November, Mr. Muir is returning for our professional development day to provide our staff with more specific, content-based lessons and curricular discussions to enhance student learning and achievement.

**Person Responsible** Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)

We will continue with cross-curricular Literacy Council meetings. These meetings will provide teachers strategies to monitor school-wide rubric and data for school-wide Literacy Initiative, increase the frequency of literacy skills in day to day activities, and introduce effective strategies to get students to think about, write about, read about, and talk about the content.

**Person Responsible** Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)

We will support our ELA teachers through creative / intentional scheduling, data mining, and the implementation of software programs designed to enhance and accelerate learning. We'll block the lowest ELA students with a specific, reading endorsed teacher for both reading and English. We'll provide data days to review the progress monitoring test data and provide a list to all teachers of the lowest 25% in ELA. ELA teachers will use IXL as a supplement for English classes (level 1's and 2's) and StudySync as a supplement for Intensive Reading and Personal Career School Development courses. The teachers will also use Canvas/Savvas along with the BEST standards training. IXL's skills are aligned to the Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards. With the IXL Analytics standards center it's simple to view student progress towards state standards. The reports in the standards center allow you to quickly evaluate student aptitude and identify trouble spots.

**Person Responsible** Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)

We hired an additional reading teacher with the ESSER funding and also have added 7 periods of Personal and Career Skills classes. This allows us to keep numbers low to provide the strongest support for struggling students. Our reading teachers will also be trained in the use of Fluency Assessments.

**Person Responsible** Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)

A multi-tiered system of student supports (MTSS) and problem-solving process will be used by school staff to ensure progress in the general education curriculum, across all grades and settings, for all students with and without disabilities. Weekly meetings will support and accelerate success for all students.

**Person Responsible** Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners****Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** Increase English Language Learners (ELL) Subgroup Proficiency

**Measurable Outcome:**

Increase ELA ELL subgroup by 3%

**Monitoring:**

One on one student conferencing with ELL teacher and para. Continued use of MY Access! reports for progress reports and resources available in Classlink such as ELL glossaries and Colorin Colorado!

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

ELL/ELA teacher will use IXL as an evidence-based strategy to supplement and strengthen skills and proficiency. The ELL teacher will also be working with content area teachers to support ELL students and the introduction of interactive technology.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Students will be more supported during learning and will have a better understanding of the ELL student and their strengths and weaknesses. IXL is an evidence-based program with an evidence level of "promising" based on ESSA criteria for evidence levels.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Classroom strategies will include word lists for EOC courses provided to students, use of tablets, Chromebooks, and apps with lessons and quizzes for student use, and student conferencing regarding student performance and goal setting to meet proficiency. Students will also have the use of Google translation and we will use USA Test Prep English grade 10 to increase vocabulary and track success.

**Person Responsible**

Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)



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

Math EOC Proficiency

**Description and**

Rationale: Our math scores showed a major decline in all 3 categories, with our greatest drop in Mathematics being the learning gains of our lowest 25% (53% - 28%).

**Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:**

To increase our mathematics learning gains of our lowest 25% from 28% to 39%.

**Monitoring:**

Progress monitoring data mining will be used by math teachers through ClearSight BOY/MOY data. This data will help drive instruction based on the students strengths and weaknesses. The teachers will share the students scores, progress, strengths, and weaknesses after each assessment. Formative assessments will be done after each critical concept is covered in both Algebra 1 and Geometry. We will use Tier 3 strategies through teacher/student conferencing.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Some evidence-based strategies will include a holistic approach to instruction as well as using web-based interactive software. Algebra Nation and Khan Academy will also be used by our math teachers and students. Khan Academy offers practice exercises, instructional videos, and a personalized learning dashboard that empower learners to study at their own pace in and outside of the classroom. We will be working with our teachers to focus on evidence-based strategies for math instruction. Key areas of focus will include visual representations and the use of manipulatives as a tool for teachers to model and demonstrate. We will also be incorporating Math XL. Math XL's skills are aligned to the Florida's B.E.S.T. Standards, the Math Florida Standards (MAFS). With the Math XL analytics standards center it's simple to view student progress towards state standards. The reports in the standards center allow you to quickly evaluate student aptitude and identify trouble spots.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

According to Khan Academy, "Students who complete 60% or more of their grade-level math on Khan Academy experienced 1.8 times their expected growth". Blending the traditional strategies with the current to focus on the teacher/student relationship in tandem with the use of technology to enhance student achievement. Students needed to interact more with the learning and teachers will incorporate project based learning.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Algebra 1 and Geometry PLC's and teacher data days / C&I to attend meetings when possible. We will continue with our data days after each progress monitoring window. Teachers will work to implement project based learning and visualization strategies.

**Person Responsible**

Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)

An additional teacher was hired with ESSER funds to reduce class size in order to provide more support in math.

**Person Responsible**

Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)



**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Increase % of students in the College and Career/Acceleration. Over the last few years many seniors have graduated without earning a college and career acceleration point.

**Measurable Outcome:**

For the 2021-22 school year, we are planning to increase 5% from our most current data.

**Monitoring:**

Starting in 9th grade, all students are placed in a course that could earn an acceleration point; AP, AICE, or Industry Certification. Students are then monitored through their high school career and intentionally scheduled into classes that could earn a college and career acceleration point.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Cathy Corsaletti (cathy.corsaletti@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

In 2020 we had a 85% pass rate in AICE classes and in 2021 our pass rate was 87%. Our AP trends over the years indicate an average pass rate of 64%. We will continue to build a master schedule that supports this goal to include several options for students to earn an acceleration point through intentional scheduling.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

By building a master schedule and increasing our options for student placement (through additional AP and AICE courses) it will provide more opportunities for students to earn college and career points.

**Action Steps to Implement**

All 9th graders will be placed in a course/section where they will have the opportunity to earn an acceleration point. 11th/12th grade transcripts will be reviewed to see if acceleration point was earned / if not attempt to place in classes for opportunity to gain acceleration point.

**Person Responsible**

Jeff Damico (jeff.damico@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional AP and AICE courses will be offered along with an additional teacher with qualifying industry certification course. We will monitor student certifications earned by teacher/course as completed.

**Person Responsible**

Jeff Damico (jeff.damico@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.

**After reviewing the data from other high schools in the state, we fell in the "High" category. Our incident per student rate and suspension rate were both above the state average. We will be working on improving in these areas and the data shows we have consistently declined in our number of suspensions since 2017. Approximately 75% of our students were referral free during last school year.**

**In contrast, 485 students have had at least one incident, which is approximately 25% of the total count. Specifically, 209 students have had one to two incidents, which is approximately 11% of the total; 205 students have had three to five incidents, that's 11%; and 71 students have had 5 or more incidents, which is 4%.**

**9th was the grade level with most incidents, at 679. The average number of OSS incidents per grade level was: 39. We will monitor with our PBiS data to reflect school culture and increase Student Government involvement to keep our environment positive and safe.**

#### **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.**

School culture develops as staff members interact with each other, the students, and the community. It becomes the guide for behavior that is shared among members of the school at large. Culture is shaped by the interactions of the stakeholders. Everyone has a role to play in building a positive school climate. Success depends on a whole school approach that includes the active involvement of school leaders, staff members, students, parents/guardians and community members who are committed to a shared vision of a safe, inclusive and accepting school community. Parents will participate in our SAC meetings and volunteer as needed with our events. Students and staff are reminded daily over the intercom of our MOJO philosophy... Motivation for success, Ownership of your actions, Journeys through education, and Optimism for the future. It just becomes the way we do things at CHS. At the beginning of the year each class is assembled to talk about culture and expectations for the upcoming year.

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

All staff play a role in promoting a positive culture. Our PBIS team works to create rewards and incentives for our students. This year we will be passing out "MOJO Money" to students for good choices, being on time, helping others, and many other opportunities. The school store will be available to "cash in" the money for small rewards or they can choose to save for student event entry such as tie dye t-shirt day, cornhole tournaments, and ice cream social to name a few. The staff will also receive incentives and be given the opportunity to earn "cash" from the principal and assistant principals for being on time to meetings, greeting students at the door, meeting deadlines, and assisting without being asked. The staff will also be able to exchange the "cash" for small rewards such as a popcorn party, bagel morning, and pizza with the principal. They can also save up for a silent auction at the end of the year. There will be at least one student and staff event a month to promote school spirit and school positive culture.

## 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: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners             | \$0.00 |
| 3      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math                         | \$0.00 |
| 4      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |  | \$0.00 |