

Charlotte County Public Schools

Charlotte Harbor School



2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
R.A.I.S.E	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19

Charlotte Harbor School

22450 HANCOCK AVE, Port Charlotte, FL 33980

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/chc>

Demographics

Principal: Herb Bennett

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2022

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	ESE
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: Maintaining 2018-19: Commendable 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Unsatisfactory
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Reaching our potential.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

Every student at Charlotte Harbor Center is an ESE student and has an IEP. To meet the needs of our students and their variety of special needs, we have additional staff to provide students with extra support and attention in the classroom. Several other professionals are employed to provide students with support such as: two behavior specialists, a dean, a social worker, school psychologist, a contracted therapist from Charlotte Behavioral Center, two physical therapists, a speech therapist, an occupational therapist, and contracted vision and hearing therapists.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bennett, Herb	Principal	As principal of the school, Mr. Bennett oversees the daily operations and functions of the school environment. He also organizes the staff for optimum success based on staff members strengths and weaknesses.
Arritt, Jon	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal, Jon Arritt offers support and counsel on overseeing the school environment and the task assignments of various staff members. He also works with teachers to develop a research based and standards based curriculum.
Cramer, Cheryl	Other	Cheryl schedules and oversees all IEP meetings. She ensures that all stakeholders participate in the meeting to ensure the accommodations and modifications in a student's IEP meets the specific needs of each student, and are provided consistently.
Underhill, Eliot	Dean	Eliot oversees the five-step discipline plan to help manage student behavior and optimize the learning environment. He also oversees MTSS meetings to collaborate with staff to resolve ongoing behavioral issues and ensure consistency in behavior management strategies.

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Not applicable. Services are provided by Charlotte County Public Schools.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/20/2022, Herb Bennett

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

129

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

24

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

23

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

1

Number of teachers with ESE certification?

24

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

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

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	2	6	6	10	5	10	9	8	13	11	10	13	24	127	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	3	2	3	5	5	4	8	5	1	3	4	44	
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	2	3	3	4	5	7	1	2	3	1	36	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	2	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	1	0	8	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	13	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	9	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	4	4	6	3	5	3	4	10	3	3	6	16	68	

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	1	2	3	3	4	5	5	6	8	4	2	4	1	48	

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	1	5	1	0	1	5	13	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/2/2022

2021-22 - 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	5	8	7	16	10	8	14	14	19	14	13	8	21	157
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	0	1	4	1	1	0	9	1	5	2	5	30
One or more suspensions	0	6	0	5	6	2	5	3	7	0	1	2	0	37
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	2	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	2	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	1	1	10	6	3	4	4	2	6	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	1	2	9	8	6	4	5	3	3	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	7	3	9	3	5	3	6	6	7	4	1	14	72

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	4	7	3	10	9	4	4	5	8	9	5	5	14	87

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	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement		49%	55%					65%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								49%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								46%	54%
Math Achievement		34%	42%					60%	62%
Math Learning Gains								43%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								35%	52%
Science Achievement		46%	54%					60%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		55%	59%					75%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	0%	69%	-69%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	49%	-49%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	46%	-46%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	55%	56%	-1%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	0%	70%	-70%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	60%	-60%	64%	-64%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	0%	56%	-56%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	80%	47%	33%	46%	34%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	71%	-71%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	78%	-78%	71%	-71%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	76%	-76%	70%	-70%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	18	19		27	37		5	20			
WHT	23	25		36	43		8				
FRL	17	17		25	32		7				
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	49	69		52	71		45	20			
HSP	20										
WHT	56	67		59	71		57				
FRL	48	74		53	75		43				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	35	58		39	49		17	29		45	
BLK	50			42	40						
WHT	33	53		44	56		20	40			
FRL	36	68		44	58		17				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	20
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	119
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	86%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	27
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	20
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?

Our goals for last school year included:

20% of 7th graders that scored a level 1 in the previous year would score a level 2 or higher on their next ELA assessment.

All students with Individualized Education Plans will have their testing accommodations reviewed and updated to meet the current needs of those special needs students that received Level 1 on either ELA or Math Assessments.

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

7th graders had 50% less level ones on the ELA assessment for the 2021-2022 school year. Regular progress monitoring, frequent check ins of academic shortfalls, and implementing IEP accommodations with fidelity all contributed to the improvement of scores.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Science showed the most overall decline in terms of academic success. Science received a 4% on the Federal Index, which is lower than any other core academic subject.

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

Based on the Federal Index, all core four subjects showed decline. English Achievement dropped from 49% to 16%. Mathematics Achievement dropped from 52% to 25%. Science went from 45% to 4%. Social Studies went from 20% to 18%.

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

An improvement in utilizing progress monitoring data needs to be done. This will help assess which students are not making improvements, so that interventions can be done by the teacher to help the student achieve academic growth.

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

Individualized CSI trainers will be on campus to work with general education core subject teachers through Mastery Connect on August 8th. Additional training will include Math 180 trainings on August 16th.

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Science showed the greatest decline in the Federal Index from 45% to 4%. Upon a closer examination of test results, it appears none of the Biology students took their EOCs. There were six science students in the eighth grade that were tested. Four of these students received a "1" on their examination and the remaining two received a "2"

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

75% of 8th grade students will score higher on their state Science assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Beginning of year, middle of year, and end of year assessments to assess student academic growth. Teachers and students will also regularly review their work in class to further assess whether or not the student is making academic gains in the classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jon Arritt (jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Progress monitoring will be done through bi-weekly reviews of student progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Progress monitoring is a evidenced based strategy as it involves the frequent review of student performance to determine whether or not students are making the necessary gains. If students are not making gains, then the method of instruction and accommodations for that student can be reviewed to determine what course of action needs to be taken to promote student success.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Progress reports are updated every 9 weeks and are reviewed by administration and school liaison.
2. Academic student shortfalls based on data will be reviewed in MTSS meetings for SANDS students, and SAT meetings for West Campus students.
3. IEP accommodations will be implemented by teachers and monitored by the school liaison quarterly.
4. Teachers will meet with students weekly for Tier 3, and bi-weekly for Tier 2 to review progress monitoring results.
5. Teachers will check in with students to help track progress toward meeting their goal.

Person Responsible

Jon Arritt (jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Students with Disabilities was the subgroup that was identified as being underserved at our school by the Federal Index. Furthermore, all of our students have disabilities and an Individualized Education Plan

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

An appropriate behavior curriculum will be incorporated into all the classrooms. Zones of Regulation will be used for West Campus, and AIM will be utilized for SANDS.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The PBIS team meets monthly to review behavior data. MTSS and SAT meetings also occur on a weekly basis to review student behavior and academic performance. These provide ample opportunities to review how the behavior curriculum is being incorporated into the classrooms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Melvin (daniel.melvin@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Implementing a behavior curriculum is one of the key components of the PBIS program, and will help teachers achieve the Social-Emotional, Independent Functioning, and Communication goals in the students Individualized Education Plan.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

SANDS and West Campus have distinct needs, and thus require distinct behavior curriculums to improve the ability of student functionality in social and academic situations.

Zones of Regulation was identified as an appropriate curriculum for West Campus as it was designed to meet the needs of students with Autism and other neurobiological disorders that hinder communication. Since the majority of West Campus is nonverbal, the program seemed most appropriate. The program is also designed to meet the needs of people aged 4 through adulthood, meaning it can be used in all of the classrooms in spite of grade level.

AIM blends aspects of Mindfulness and Applied Behavior Analysis to students with emotional and behavioral challenges. The students on SANDS Campus are identified as EBD students, making this program more appropriate for them.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Materials for AIM and Zones of Regulation will be distributed to teachers.
2. PBIS meetings will review behavior data to determine which classrooms are struggling to incorporate the behavior curriculum into learning.
3. MTSS meetings on SANDS and SAT meetings on West Campus will provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate and share effective strategies for incorporating a behavior curriculum in the classroom.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups,

please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

9 out of 14 kindergarten-second grade students have been identified in the Early Warning Systems data as having a significant reading deficiency, which comes to 64% of students in this group. This information was gathered from Focus.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

14 out of 25 students third-fifth grade students have been identified in the Early Warning Systems data as having a significant reading deficiency, which comes to 56% of students in this group. This information was gathered from Focus.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

100% of second grade students will show improvement on their end of year progress monitoring scores in ELA.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

100% of third, fourth, and fifth grade students will show improvement on their end of year progress monitoring scores in ELA.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Beginning of year, middle of year, and end of year assessments to assess student academic growth. Teachers and students will also regularly review their work in class to further assess whether or not the student is making academic gains in the classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Arritt, Jon, jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The strategy implemented to show improvement in ELA for K-5 students will be the use of Instructional Conversations and Literature Logs. These are two activities designed to improve reading comprehension. Instructional Conversations involve a group discussion about a text that was read in class. This is done to

enhance listening skills, oral language skills, and critical thinking about the text. The Literature Logs require the students to write responses to questions or prompts about the text. This activity is designed to improve skills in writing, comprehension, and critical thinking. Two studies have been done on this strategy and have indicated promising results, with the average student improving their reading achievement scores by 29%.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The strategy is designed to be used primarily with 2nd-5th grade, which makes up 85% of the students within the K-5 group that are identified as having a reading deficiency. Thus, the strategy is appropriate for their grade level and targets the skills in need for improvement

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
1. Literacy Leadership will introduce the strategy of Instructional Conversations and Literature Logs to teachers.	
2. Teachers will implement the strategy and utilize it in activities at least once a week with students.	
3. Weekly MTSS meetings will review the progress of students in classrooms utilizing the strategy. This allows for assessment of the efficacy of the strategy and allows Literacy Leaders and Coaches to help teachers better implement their strategies.	Arritt, Jon, jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

PBIS linked to classroom management strategies

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

PBIS meets monthly and reviews the behavior data from Focus of students and can determine which classrooms are having behavior problems. MTSS and SAT meetings can be used to collect information from teachers about how their respective behavior curriculum is being implemented in classrooms. The Zones of Regulation will be used for West Campus and AIM will be used for SANDS Campus.

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

It will be conveyed to teachers through staff meetings and the initial distribution of the materials.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

Reviews of behavior data will allow the team to assess which classroom is teaching positive behavior strategies effectively, and which classes are struggling. MTSS and SAT meetings will provide teachers opportunities to share what strategies have been working and provide struggling teachers with support so that all staff can implement the behavior curriculum effectively and consistently.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Materials for AIM and Zones of Regulation will be distributed to teachers. 2. PBIS meetings will review behavior data to determine which classrooms are struggling to incorporate the behavior curriculum into learning. 3. MTSS meetings on SANDS and SAT meetings on West Campus will provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate and share effective strategies for incorporating a behavior curriculum in the classroom. 	<p>Melvin, Daniel, daniel.melvin@yourcharlotteschools.net</p>