

Charlotte County Public Schools

Punta Gorda Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Punta Gorda Middle School

1001 EDUCATION AVE, Punta Gorda, FL 33950

<http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/pgms>

Demographics

Principal: Samuel Davis

Start Date for this Principal: 6/16/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (48%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Punta Gorda Middle School

1001 EDUCATION AVE, Punta Gorda, FL 33950

<http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/pgms>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

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.

Punta Gorda Middle School Mission Statement:

Relentlessly pursuing academic and personal growth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Punta Gorda Middle School Vision Statement

We exist to prepare students academically and socially for the rigors of high school/college/career and to develop admirable citizens in our community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dionisio, Tina	Principal	Principal Tina Dionisio, establishes clearly defined roles and expectations for the PGMS leadership team and leads the school overall. Mrs. Dionisio communicates the school's vision and mission to all stakeholders. She functions as the school's main spokesperson. She establishes expectations which are rigorous, clearly defined and measurable. She models open communication and speaks frankly about success and failure. Mrs. Dionisio's leadership fosters a highly collaborative atmosphere where the sharing of ideas is encouraged. She serves as the administrative leader for the science and social studies departments. She serves as the chair of the PPC, liaison to the school District Leadership Team and all NET Teacher development. She oversees the school's budget, makes final decisions regarding facility use, teachers assignments and the master schedule.
Nicklas, Scott	Assistant Principal	Dr. Scott Nicklas is the assistant principal for facilities and is the administrative leader of our ESE programs. He oversees all issues related to school safety, including the scheduling and carrying out of all fire, tornado and active assailant drills. He supervises and evaluates all of the custodial staff. He coordinates the scheduling of building maintenance and repairs and ensure proper upkeep of campus grounds. He is the administrative sponsor of our school's PBiS (Positive Behavior Support) team. Dr. Nicklas also oversees all school activities including clubs and intramurals. He leads the paraprofessional staff and coordinates busses. Dr. Nicklas supervises the school inventory, including textbooks.
Young, Christine	Assistant Principal	Dr. Christine Young is the assistant principal of curriculum. She serves as the administrative leader for all ELA, Math and Intensive Reading and evaluates all instructional staff across these departments. She is responsible for designing, implementing and balancing a master schedule. She establishes the standardized testing schedules for progress monitoring, FSAA, ACCESS for ELL, and FSA. She creates and maintains the school calendar. She serves as the district contact for Canvas implementation. She serves as the Coordinator of Credit Recovery.
McLain, Renee	Assistant Principal	Ms. Renee McClain is assistant principal for discipline. She handles all discipline for the school. She supervises the Dean of Students and school security officers. She serves as a liaison to the School Resource Officers. She coordinates annual safety trainings. She is in charge of bullying investigations and the district bully cabinet files. She handles all reassignment requests and revocations. She serves as the liaison to the PTO and coordinate school volunteers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/16/2014, Samuel Davis

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

24

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,142

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

23

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

18

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	340	393	411	0	0	0	0	1144
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	75	84	0	0	0	0	254
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	117	113	0	0	0	0	259
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	69	101	0	0	0	0	207
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	113	85	0	0	0	0	246
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	67	114	0	0	0	0	224
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	87	85	0	0	0	0	231
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	55	81	0	0	0	0	184

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	63	119	135	0	0	0	0	317

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	7	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	15

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/16/2022

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	385	429	424	0	0	0	0	1238
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	89	103	0	0	0	0	273
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	96	94	0	0	0	0	211
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	74	72	0	0	0	0	190
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	82	85	0	0	0	0	209
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	85	92	0	0	0	0	224
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	108	99	0	0	0	0	267
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	85	92	0	0	0	0	224

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	49	110	116	0	0	0	0	275

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	8	15	9	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	0	0	0	0	13

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	385	429	424	0	0	0	0	1238
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	89	103	0	0	0	0	273
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	96	94	0	0	0	0	211
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	74	72	0	0	0	0	190
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	82	85	0	0	0	0	209
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	85	92	0	0	0	0	224
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	108	99	0	0	0	0	267
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	85	92	0	0	0	0	224

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	49	110	116	0	0	0	0	275

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	8	15	9	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	0	0	0	0	13

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	50%	49%	50%				49%	54%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	41%						45%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	28%						38%	46%	47%
Math Achievement	53%	35%	36%				61%	63%	58%
Math Learning Gains	48%						52%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						40%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	55%	53%				53%	59%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	54%	58%				83%	78%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	45%	49%	-4%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	47%	46%	1%	52%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
08	2022					
	2019	51%	56%	-5%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	53%	51%	2%	55%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	62%	62%	0%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2022					
	2019	44%	47%	-3%	46%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	53%	55%	-2%	48%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	83%	78%	5%	71%	12%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	96%	64%	32%	61%	35%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	62%	-62%	57%	-57%

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	20	28	20	25	36	28	20	35	42		
ELL	28	47	36	29	41	29	18	54			
ASN	69	40		88	81						
BLK	33	31	24	35	35	32	31	39	24		
HSP	42	40	36	40	42	36	39	69	62		
MUL	49	39	13	49	52	39	42	66	58		
WHT	53	43	28	58	50	35	52	73	66		
FRL	40	35	28	44	40	32	36	60	47		
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	19	33	29	24	34	30	24	32	33		
ELL	28	37	46	30	46	38					

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
ASN				70	70						
BLK	34	33	35	44	40	28	22	58	42		
HSP	48	42	27	50	46	34	54	59	70		
MUL	47	41	20	52	42	24	47	52	50		
WHT	54	49	37	56	49	36	46	73	61		
FRL	45	44	35	47	43	35	40	58	51		
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	21	33	31	29	41	43	21	53	36		
ELL	45	71	71	52	41	7					
ASN	73	55		95	82		70				
BLK	40	40	32	44	37	34	27	88			
HSP	43	47	45	53	49	35	45	87	46		
MUL	53	66	54	60	52	38	74	80	81		
WHT	50	43	37	63	53	41	55	82	60		
FRL	41	42	35	53	49	41	47	80	47		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	70
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	45
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	51
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

When looking at school grades beginning in 2015-2016, overall achievement in math (60) and ELA (53) have returned to pre-pandemic levels. When looking at cohort trends, students come in 6th grade with strong scores but the trend shows they decline as they approach 8th grade, in Math and Science.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math in the 8th grade, Pre-Algebra(27), not Algebra 1 and Social Studies (80) have not returned to pre-pandemic level.

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

Staff turnover is a major factor, we have had several staff changes over the last two years in 8th grade Math and Civics. Our focus for both departments is to provide time for content planning and data analysis in weekly PLC's. While completing our BPiE, we realized our ESE teachers need time with both regular Ed and ESE for PLC's so we have corrected that this year. We are also working with the C&I's for both Social Studies and Math to help provide guidance for all. We also believe another contributing factor was that several of our 8th grade teachers were allowing their students a little more freedom simply because they are in 8th grade. We are now working with all 8th grade teachers to monitor their students more closely.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA Learning Gains (46 to 54)

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

Consistency with staff and student attendance. The Reading Coach providing data analysis and strategies to staff and students. Intensive Reading was provided to all students with Level 1 achievement as directed by the CERP.

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

Math 180 in a High Dosage Tutoring environment and implementing Mastery Connect to monitor mastery of the standards in all Math and Science 8 classes then making necessary changes in instruction.

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 Math 180 training facilitated by Secondary Math C&I and Math 180 consultant;
Training in High Dosage Tutoring provided by the secondary math C&I and supported by math coach;
Training in Mastery Connect provided by content area C&Is.

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

Both coaches(Math & Reading) working with teachers analyzing their data and classroom practices. The Reading coach will work with Science and Social Studies depts as well. PLC's designated for specific data discussions as well as content planning. District sponsored data days. Implementation of new curriculum materials. Free after school tutoring program.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. 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.

Performance for SWD in Math is currently at 25% which is below the 41% threshold.
Performance for SWD in ELA is currently at 20% which is below the 41% threshold.

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

Students with disabilities will perform at 41% or better in the areas of Math and ELA.

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

Will monitor participation on locally designed formative assessments in all ELA and math classes for all level 1 students and ESE students. Assistant Principal of Curriculum will monitor participation. The frequency of assessments is different in math (per unit) and ELA (bi-weekly). Providing Read 180 and Barton (or other tier 3 reading intervention) in Intensive Reading classes. Math 180 will be provided in the Math Intensive classes. The Reading and Math Coaches will monitor implementation of Math 180 and Read 180 by conducting data chats and classroom visits.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Frequent Formative Assessments - frequent curriculum-based formative assessment can be used to provide remediation as well as change the direction of instruction based needs.

Read 180 - READ 180 Universal instructional model, Whole-Group Learning, Student Application (Student App), Small-Group Learning, and Independent Reading are Station Rotations used to maximize learning and teacher effectiveness.

Math 180 - Math 180 teachers partner with technology to help maximize teacher effectiveness. Students benefit from this partnership by receiving consistent instruction that is fully optimized and allowing mastery and advancement at an accelerated pace.

Barton Reading & Spelling - The Barton Reading & Spelling System was designed as intense intervention for students who struggle to easily and accurately decode words when reading (despite being taught phonics), who by second grade are slow and inaccurate readers (missing oral reading fluency benchmarks), and who have always struggled with spelling – especially when writing sentences, and stories.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Frequent Formative Assessments - "Formative assessment is a process that engages teachers and students in gathering, interpreting, and using evidence about what and

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

how students are learning.” Research indicates that students who participated in formative assessment perform better than those who do not. Formative assessment guides educator decisions to make midstream adjustments to instruction that address learner needs in a timely manner. (LearningSciences.com)
 Read 180 - The What Works Clearinghouse determined that the extent of evidence for the impact of READ 180 on student achievement is medium to large for general literacy achievement and for comprehension.
 Math 180 - Meets ESSA “MODERATE” Evidence Criteria
 Barton Reading & Spelling - There are 15 independent studies from public and private schools across the nation that prove the effectiveness of the Barton Reading & Spelling System. (Barton. S., 2021)

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.

ELA and Intensive Reading Teachers will implement formative assessments on a weekly, bi-weekly and monthly basis.

Person Responsible Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Alongside the reading or math coach ELA , Intensive Reading Teachers and Intensive Math Teachers will disaggregate the data captured by the formative assessments on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

With the support of a content area coach (Reading or math), teachers will apply results of formative assessments to instructional decision-making on a monthly basis. As identified in our BPIE, teachers will do this with both ESE and regular education teachers.

Person Responsible Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

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

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

From 2019 - 2022, 8th grade Math scores went from 44% proficient to 27% proficient.

Measurable**Outcome:**

State the specific measurable

outcome the school plans to achieve.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

To raise the percent proficient to at least 45% for Math 8.

Monitoring:

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

Will monitor locally designed formative assessments twice per month during PLCs along with classroom walkthroughs and Math 180 for the identified level 2 students. Will monitor the implementation of newly adopted curriculum materials.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Frequent Formative Assessments - frequent curriculum-based formative assessment can be used to provide remediation as well as change the direction of instruction based on learner needs. Formative assessments implemented at the conclusion of each unit of study.
Math 180 - Math 180 teachers partner with technology to help maximize teacher effectiveness. Students benefit from this partnership by receiving consistent instruction that is fully optimized and allowing them to master skills and advance at an accelerated pace.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Frequent Formative Assessments - "Formative assessment is a process that engages teachers and students in gathering, interpreting, and using evidence about what and how students are learning." Research indicates that students who participated in formative assessment perform better than those who do not. Formative assessment guides educator decisions to make midstream adjustments to instruction that address learner needs in a timely manner. (LearningSciences.com)
Math 180 - Meets ESSA "MODERATE" Evidence Criteria

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.

With the support of the math coach, teachers will implement curriculum-based Formative Assessments and use Math 180 in the Math Intensive classroom as they occur.

Person Responsible Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

With the support of the math coach, teachers will disaggregate data of both formative assessment results on a monthly basis and results from PM1 and PM2 as they occur.

Person Responsible Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

With the support of the math coach, teachers apply information learned from data disaggregation to instructional decision making on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

With the support of the ELL teacher, Math teachers will apply information learned from data disaggregation to instructional decision making with our ELL students on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

With the support of the math coach, teachers apply information learned from data disaggregation to instructional decision making for our Black and Economically Disadvantaged students on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3. 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.

From 2019 - 2022, 8th grade Science scores were 47% which is lowest in the district.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

We would like to raise the scores to at least 53%.

Monitoring:

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

Will monitor locally designed formative assessments twice per month during PLCs along with classroom walkthroughs. Will monitor the implementation of adopted curriculum materials. Will monitor spiral alignment of concepts grades 6-8 through the use of PLCs for data analysis and content planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

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

Frequent Formative Assessments - frequent curriculum-based formative assessment can be used to provide remediation as well as change the direction of instruction based on learner needs.

Professional Learning Communities for data analysis and content planning. PLCs focus on the goal of formal education as not simply to "ensure that students are taught but to ensure that they learn. (ASCD, 2022)" This department needs to build a culture of collaboration by reflecting on student data together.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the

Frequent Formative Assessments - "Formative assessment is a process that engages teachers and students in gathering, interpreting, and using evidence about what and how students are learning." Evidence indicates that students who participated in formative assessment perform better than those who do not. Formative assessment guides educator decisions to make midstream adjustments to instruction that address learner needs in a timely manner. (LearningSciences.com). Frequent Formative Assessments provide data by which instructors can adjust future instructional decisions.

resources/

criteria used for selecting this strategy. By using the PLC for data analysis and content planning, adjustments to instruction can be targeted and more effective.

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.

Implement progress monitoring with data days to explore trends and areas in need of improvement (BOY,EOY). Implement weekly/biweekly formative assessments in conjunction with a PLC for data discussions. PLC for data analysis scheduled 1Xmonth and PLC for content planning scheduled 1Xmonth.

Person Responsible Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Work with C&I to disaggregate the formative assessment data for the purpose of impacting instructional decision-making as they occur.

Person Responsible Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teachers will apply results of data disaggregation to future instructional decisions by participating in a PLC for content planning on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

With the support of the ELL teacher, Science teachers will apply information learned from data disaggregation to instructional decision making with our ELL students on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Teachers will apply results of data disaggregation of our Black and Economically Disadvantaged students to future instructional decisions by participating in a PLC for content planning on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible Christine Young (christine.young@yourcharlotteschools.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

PGMS meets regularly with the School Advisory Committee to inform them on school plans and consult with them about school needs. The SAC is diverse and represents the wider community of stakeholder groups (parents, teachers and community members). Our communication strategy is to use many diverse forms including Remind texts, School Messenger phone calls and emails as well as handouts. We use several of

these forms to alert stakeholders about important and timely information pertaining to the school. Our PTO organization plays a vital role in hosting school events and raising discretionary funds. The Principal serves on the board of Drug Free Punta Gorda. And Drug Free Charlotte County is a regular presence in the school.

This year we will be implementing a step-system in conjunction with PBIS in an effort to decrease behavior incidents. The step system increases communication among parents, teachers and students to work together to help correct the behavior. The PBIS program analyzes the discipline data and presents it to the staff monthly. They also provide positive supports weekly to encourage positive choices as well as other rewards after each quarter.

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

Our stakeholders include parents/guardians, students and staff. The role of the parent/guardian is to provide the supports to have their student to school on time and ready to learn. The student's role is to engage with instruction and seek out supports when needed. The staff's role is to provide engaging instruction to guide students to resources when needed.