

Charlotte County Public Schools

Port Charlotte High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

| Table of Contents | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Port Charlotte High School

18200 COCHRAN BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33948

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/pchs>

Demographics

Principal: Louis Long III

Start Date for this Principal: 3/1/2015

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 9-12 |
| 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) | 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 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 (50%) 2017-18: B (56%) |
| 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 | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Port Charlotte High School

18200 COCHRAN BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33948

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/pchs>

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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School 9-12 | No | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 47% |

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.

The Port Charlotte High School (PCHS) mission is to promote personal, academic, and career achievement by supporting students to become independent and self-sufficient adults who will succeed and contribute with integrity and responsibility in our community and beyond. Through PCHS's PRIDE Initiative, all students are expected to demonstrate:

Preparation: Come to school with materials and positive attitudes.

Respect: Treat your school and peers with consideration and courtesy.

Integrity: Practice personal honesty and independence.

Determination: Set and work towards goals.

Excellence: Strive to be your best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Port Charlotte High School all stakeholders will work together to promote personal, academic, and professional achievement among our students. We strive to assist students in becoming responsible and respectful adults who will succeed and contribute to a global community through their post secondary endeavors.

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 |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| Long, Lou | Principal | Budget Community and Media Finance (Internal & District Funds) Staff Steward Graduation Rate Lead Contact School Climate and Culture Leader Assistant Principals Administrative & Office Assistants Community & Media Contact Leave Requests Supplements |
| Forbus, Natasha | Assistant Principal | Curriculum/Testing Advance Ed. Lead for SACS Accreditation Cambridge AICE Coordinator Advanced Placement Supervisor Career Information Center (CIC) Lead ESOL Lead Contact Grade 10 Lead (Balkman) Guidance Professional Supervisor Master Schedule Lead NET Teacher Partnership and Performance Council (PPC) Co-Chair Professional Development/Professional Learning Community (PLC) Lead Program Planner Supervisor School Advisory Council (SAC) Lead School Improvement Plan (SIP) Lead Testing (ACT, SAT, PSAT/NMSQT, PSAT 8/9/10, FSA, EOC, AICE, AP) |
| Curtis, Paul | Assistant Principal | Student Services/ESE AESOP Athletics Attendance Career and College Readiness (CACR) Lead True North Logic Deans Destination Graduation Discipline Emergency/Crisis Plans ESE Lead Contact Grade 12 Lead (Harvey) Paraprofessionals Registration/Reassignments/Withdrawals Security SERT Supervisor |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | Support PPC RTI / MTSS / Threat Assessments Textbooks |
| McIntosh, Daniel | Assistant Principal | Facilities/Activities Administrative Coverage Capital Outlay Custodial Services (Neff) Grade 11 Lead (Strauss) Inventory Master Calendar Technology Textbooks Underclassmen Awards |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 3/1/2015, Louis Long III

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.*

0

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

82

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,664

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

6

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

8

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 488 | 455 | 393 | 374 | 1710 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 124 | 82 | 79 | 424 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 83 | 55 | 33 | 254 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 79 | 91 | 53 | 239 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 155 | 180 | 119 | 566 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 137 | 140 | 79 | 485 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 175 | 130 | 46 | 463 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 69 | 114 | 56 | 318 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 151 | 162 | 122 | 585 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 21 | 9 | 4 | 49 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 14 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/15/2022

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 428 | 411 | 393 | 382 | 1614 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 101 | 76 | 95 | 384 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 54 | 35 | 20 | 152 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 146 | 103 | 82 | 398 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 122 | 102 | 86 | 394 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 160 | 100 | 103 | 442 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 71 | 48 | 42 | 236 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 160 | 100 | 103 | 442 |

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 | 112 | 140 | 94 | 100 | 446 | |

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 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 |

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 | 0 | 428 | 411 | 393 | 382 | 1614 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 101 | 76 | 95 | 384 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 54 | 35 | 20 | 152 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 146 | 103 | 82 | 398 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 122 | 102 | 86 | 394 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 160 | 100 | 103 | 442 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 71 | 48 | 42 | 236 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 160 | 100 | 103 | 442 |

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 | 112 | 140 | 94 | 100 | 446 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | |

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 | 39% | 45% | 52% | | | | 42% | 62% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 39% | 44% | 52% | | | | 38% | 54% | 51% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 29% | 33% | 41% | | | | 29% | 45% | 42% |
| Math Achievement | 31% | 39% | 41% | | | | 43% | 64% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | 28% | 37% | 48% | | | | 47% | 56% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 35% | 37% | 49% | | | | 38% | 52% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | 60% | 62% | 61% | | | | 67% | 72% | 68% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 60% | 68% | 68% | | | | 68% | 80% | 73% |

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 |

| 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 |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 66% | 71% | -5% | 67% | -1% |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 69% | 76% | -7% | 70% | -1% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 28% | 64% | -36% | 61% | -33% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 51% | 62% | -11% | 57% | -6% |

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 | 21 | 30 | 23 | 15 | 27 | 30 | 45 | 37 | | 86 | 36 |
| ELL | 26 | 38 | 20 | 19 | 39 | 60 | 50 | | | 88 | 79 |
| ASN | 74 | 67 | | 75 | 27 | | | | | 92 | 91 |
| BLK | 29 | 32 | 17 | 19 | 32 | 43 | 47 | 52 | | 100 | 65 |
| HSP | 34 | 39 | 23 | 24 | 29 | 38 | 55 | 58 | | 89 | 65 |
| MUL | 39 | 25 | | 33 | 22 | 30 | 63 | 72 | | 91 | 86 |
| WHT | 41 | 40 | 35 | 35 | 28 | 31 | 63 | 61 | | 90 | 68 |
| FRL | 31 | 32 | 29 | 27 | 25 | 25 | 55 | 55 | | 89 | 66 |
| 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 | 22 | 33 | 27 | 20 | 24 | 27 | 35 | 37 | | 84 | 38 |
| ELL | 8 | 30 | | 15 | 19 | | | | | 92 | 73 |

| 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 | 69 | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 30 | 23 | 14 | 19 | 22 | 33 | 43 | | 96 | 58 |
| HSP | 43 | 40 | 23 | 28 | 27 | 22 | 52 | 45 | | 95 | 74 |
| MUL | 44 | 43 | | 21 | 19 | | 60 | 31 | | 82 | 57 |
| WHT | 39 | 37 | 27 | 23 | 21 | 22 | 50 | 60 | | 89 | 75 |
| FRL | 33 | 35 | 27 | 19 | 19 | 16 | 42 | 40 | | 89 | 68 |
| 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 | 29 | 30 | 23 | 31 | | 38 | 41 | | 88 | 18 |
| ELL | 24 | 23 | 23 | 33 | 45 | | 38 | | | | |
| ASN | 65 | 50 | | 57 | 54 | | 73 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 34 | 24 | 30 | 37 | | 62 | 54 | | 85 | 28 |
| HSP | 40 | 40 | 36 | 38 | 29 | 20 | 61 | 67 | | 94 | 50 |
| MUL | 38 | 32 | | 26 | 36 | | 71 | 71 | | 94 | 33 |
| WHT | 45 | 39 | 28 | 49 | 54 | 45 | 70 | 73 | | 91 | 39 |
| FRL | 35 | 35 | 27 | 35 | 44 | 38 | 60 | 64 | | 88 | 38 |

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 | 47 |
| 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 | 38 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 519 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 96% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 35 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 46 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 71 |
| 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 | 44 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 44 |
| 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 | 51 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | 42 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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?

ELA Achievement - 39 (+0)
 ELA Learning Gains - 39 (+1)
 ELA L25 Learning Gains - 29 (+1)
 Math Achievement- 31 (+8)
 Math Learning Gain- 28 (+6)
 Math L25 Learning Gains- 35 (+12)
 Science - 60 (+11)
 Social Studies- 60 (+7)

In the core areas, we made growth or maintained the same percentage points as the 2020-2021 SY.

Our largest increase in percentage points from 2021 to 2022 came from Math L25 Gains.

Our lowest amount of percentage points gained was in ELA. We made the same amount of percentage points in achievement as the 2020-2021 SY, and made very little growth in our ELA/L25 gains. Our 10th grade students scored the lowest in the area of achievement at 24%.

In the areas of Achievement, we scored the highest in Social Studies and Science.

Our Students with Disabilities dropped percentage points in all areas except Math & Math L25 Gains from 2021 to 2022.

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

Based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, our greatest need for improvement is in ELA (all components and subgroups included), Math achievement and learning gains (scored the lowest in the area of achievement and LG), and all areas for Students with Disabilities.

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

Contributing factors were lack of certified teaching staff and poor student attendance.

New Actions:

1. Instructional Support: Providing meaningful data from FAST, DRI, and DFA. Providing professional development for instructional methods, classroom management, knowledge of B.E.S.T standards, and

use of curriculum.

2. Implementing both a discipline structure and positive behavior support system to encourage student attendance.
3. Finding ways to provide enjoyable events/ incentives to staff in order to maintain a positive school climate.

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

Based on progress monitoring and state assessments, the data components with the most improvement were Science Achievement (Improved by 11 percentage points in Biology) and Math L25 learning gains (Improved by 12 percentage points).

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

-Science achievement: SIMS training for all new science teachers. We were able to hire certified science teachers at the beginning of the 2021-2022 SY.

-Math L25 learning gains: Math coach supported the math department by modeling lessons, providing small group instruction, supported classroom teacher in pacing and standard based instruction.

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

-Evaluating all data that is available at the student and standard level. We have access to data that drills down to the standard being assessed, this data shows us exactly where students needs more instruction or have gained mastery and can move forward. It will allow for teachers to differentiate instruction based on student needs.

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.

-B.E.S.T standards trainings: Teachers are given time with content area C & I to learn the standards and their use within the curriculum and pacing.

-Mastery Connect: Teachers have access to all DRI and DFA data through mastery connect. These trainings will provide an opportunity to learn the various data points that can be accessed, how to access them, how to use them to drive instruction.

-Learning Walks: This provides teachers an opportunity to see various instructional methods, classroom routines and procedures, and the way their peers are using the curriculum. This allow the teacher to see this in action with students they also have in their classrooms.

-Instructional Strategies: The opportunities are provided at the school level and involve many topics. We include classroom management, teaching content, student practice, and assessment.

-Use of Technology: This training is being provided at both the district and school level. It includes training for use of the touchscreen panels, use of Canvas, use of mastery connect, and any assessment details related to technology.

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

-Consistent scheduling of data discussions: Teachers of all tested areas are being pulled by content area C & I to evaluate the data after each major testing event (FAST, DRI). In the interim teachers will meet with reading/math coaches or APC to discuss DFA data.

-Opportunities for staff collaboration: English and intensive reading teachers that share students are required to meet biweekly to discuss specific student concerns and collaboratively plan. This is the same for the Algebra 1 and high dosage tutoring teacher.

-Monitoring specific student progress: When receiving data from the district or pulling data at the school level we will look specifically at data that correlates directly to our areas of greatest need.

-MTSS/RTi meetings: This will be the forum to discuss students concerns based on academic progress and create a plan to support students and their specific needs.

-BPiE (Best Practices for Inclusive Education): Continuing to meet the specific needs of our students with disabilities based on this comprehensive plan and their Individual Educational Plans.

-CERP (Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan) - All students that have scored a level 1 on their FSA or FAST ELA will be continue to be placed in an intensive reading course until they score above a level 1. This course is intended to give students direct instruction needed to improve reading skills.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The percentage of daily attendance was 90% in the 2021-2022 SY. Students will not learn if they are not present.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal for the 2022-2023 SY is to achieve 93% or higher average daily attendance. This includes monitoring full day and per period attendance.

We will monitor the desired outcome by using FOCUS analytics.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance Core Team meets weekly. This team will manage and monitor attendance.

Dr. Curtis, Ms. Wendorf, Mrs. Tridle, Ms. Pulliam, & Mrs. Czech make up our PCHS' Attendance Team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Curtis (paul.curtis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

PBIS Plan: Students will receive rewards each quarter if they have met the attendance expectation (No more than two full days of absences-No more than 3 late arrivals to class or classes skipped).

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

Tier 1: Students are aware of the matrix of discipline. This is based on number of offenses. Students that do not achieve the reward in one quarter, have a fresh start and an opportunity to earn the reward for the next quarter.

Tier 2: Students that are frequently tardy to class or are skipping specific class periods will meet with Ms. Pulliam. During these meetings students will discuss reasons for missing class time and any support they feel they need in order to attend class. Ms. Pulliam receives these students names from teachers.

Tier 3: Chronic absenteeism is discussed in attendance meeting. Social workers make home visits and offer support to get students back on campus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

93% would be a 3% increase from last years attendance data. Our goal is to show a 3% increase.

In order to attain this goal we are communicating a higher expectation to students of 95%. 95% attendance in a quarter means a student does not miss more than two full days. We have explained the expectation to all students and notified families through various forms of communication to home.

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.

-Schedule events/rewards that students will work towards achieving (All events will

Quarter 1 - Taking students to centennial recreation park

Quarter 2 - Hosting a dance at the school

Quarter 3 - Walking field trip to the movies

Quarter 4 - Trip to the beach (The end of year trip is based on full year attendance no more than 5 days absent)

Family Friday: Students with perfect attendance for the week will be eligible to receive a gift card on Friday.

Person Responsible Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

-Schedule transportation - School Busses

Person Responsible Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

-Communicate goal and rewards to all students, families, and community:

Posters around campus, during SAC meetings, through social media, and during student events such as class meetings and pep rallies.

Person Responsible Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

-Monitor attendance reports - Through FOCUS reports, during weekly attendance meetings

Person Responsible Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#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.

This subgroup of students dropped percentage points in many areas. Because of this, we had an overall Federal index score of 35% (Under the required 41%). This keeps the SWD subgroup within the TS&I designation.

ELA Achievement - 21 (-1)
 ELA Learning Gains - 30 (-3)
 ELA L25 Learning Gains - 23 (-4)
 Math Achievement- 15 (-5)
 Math Learning Gain- 27 (+3)
 Math L25 Learning Gains- 30 (+3)
 Science - 45 (+10)
 Social Studies- 37 (+0)

The SWD subgroup will achieve a Federal index score of 41% or higher.

Measurable Outcome:

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

246 points needed.

ELA Achievement - 25 (+4)
 Math Achievement- 17 (+2)
 Science - 45 (+0)
 Social Studies- 40 (+3)
 Grad - 86
 C&C - 36

Monitoring:

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

-Monitor performance of PM1 & PM2 within the TIDE portal.
 -Monitor performance of DRI 1, 2, & 3 in all areas within Mastery Connect.
 -Monitor performance on unit assessments within Mastery Connect.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

All level 1 ESE students are enrolled in Intensive Reading. This course offers smaller class sizes and use of Read 180.

All freshmen SWD that scored a 2 on their last FSA math assessment have been placed in a foundational math course. Within this course students are receiving high dosage tutoring in Algebra 1 content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Read 180 is an evidence based program. The smaller class sizes paired with the Read 180 program will give students maximum support in this area of need.

The foundational math course offers high dosage tutoring. The class sizes are small (8-10 students). The purpose is to provide one to one tutoring for Algebra 1 content they are learning in a separate course.

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.

Following progress monitoring windows, teachers of SWD will meet with content area coaches to analyze data for SWD and create individualized plans for students not demonstrating learning gains.

Person Responsible Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

School Leadership will identify professional development needs for teachers based on classroom observations and communicate these needs to math and ELA coaches.

Person Responsible Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Coaches will create and deliver ongoing, targeted, job-embedded professional learning opportunities for teachers.

Person Responsible Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

ELA made the least amount of improvement of all content areas from the 2021 to the 2022 SY.
The achievement score made no improvement and each section of learning gains improved by only one percentage point.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the area of ELA we plan to make an achievement score of 43% or higher.

Monitoring:

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

-PM 1 & 2: Reviewing teacher data, student data, standard based data (Admin and Coaches)
-Unit Assessments: Reviewing teacher data, student data, standard based data (Admin and coaches)
-Teacher feedback: During collaborative planning meetings/ Department meetings
-Walkthroughs: Admin feedback from weekly walkthroughs (Is instruction standards based, on grade, and aligned with the pacing guide).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

-Standard based instruction
-Read 180 within intensive reading course

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

Read 180 is direct and targeted instruction for low performing students. The intensive reading courses offer small class sizes and more opportunity to build foundational skills.

Teaching to the standards and identifying them for students allows the students to know the objectives and ways to show mastery of content.

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.

-Review results from PM, DRI, DFA, and other unit assessments.

Person Responsible

Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

-Reading coach meets bi-weekly with all 9th and 10th grade ELA teachers. They discuss student data and instructional concerns or needs. They also plan for instruction based on PM, DRI, & DFA results.

Person Responsible

Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

-provide professional development in instructional strategies, B.E.S.T. standards, pacing, PACE.

Person Responsible

Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#4. 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.

Our overall Math Achievement score was the lowest performing (achievement) content area (31%).

Algebra 1 - 26%

Geometry - 36%

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase our Math Achievement performance to 37% proficient.

Algebra 1 - 38% (+12)

Geometry - 36%

Monitoring:

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

-DRI 1, 2, & 3: Reviewing teacher data, student data, standard based data (Admin and Coaches)

-Unit Assessments: Reviewing teacher data, student data, standard based data (Admin and coaches)

-Teacher feedback: During collaborative planning meetings/Department meetings

-Walkthroughs: Admin feedback from weekly walkthroughs (Is instruction standards based, on grade, and aligned with the pacing guide).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

-Standard based instruction

-High Dosage Tutoring (All freshmen that scored a level 2 on their most recent FSA Math assessment)

-Math 180

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Math 180 is direct and targeted instruction for low performing students. This program is being used in the foundations for math course along with the high dosage tutoring strategy. The class offers small class sizes and more opportunity to build foundational skills. The high dosage tutoring correlates directly to the content the student is receiving in their Algebra 1 course.

Teaching to the standards and identifying them for students allows the students to know the objectives and ways to show mastery of content.

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.

-Review results from DRI & DFA during DLC.

Person Responsible

Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

-Math coach meets bi-weekly with all Algebra 1 teachers. They discuss student data and instructional concerns or needs. They also plan for instruction based on DRI & DFA results.

Person Responsible

Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

-Math coach meets bi-weekly with all Algebra 1 teachers and high dosage tutor. They discuss student data and instructional concerns or needs. They also plan for instruction based on DRI & DFA results.

Person Responsible Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Algebra 1 and High dosage tutor collaboratively lesson plan to meet the needs of each student individually.

Person Responsible Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@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.

Our theme for this school year is "Get involved, Stay involved". We began the school year by encouraging our staff to get back involved in all areas of the school day. We review data points, discuss our successes, and encourage staff to seek support in their areas of need. We have encouraged staff to seek professional development and collaboration with their colleagues. As an admin team we are dedicated to spending time in classrooms and providing meaningful feedback.

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

Every stakeholder has a role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school. Support is necessary from staff, families, students, and the community.

Stakeholders:

PBIS- Matina Pulliam & Admin Team

Admin: Family Friday - Rewarding perfect attendance for staff and students,

Instructional staff: Implement positive rewards in classrooms, and assist in recognizing students for attendance and academics.

Students: Students along with grade level sponsors participate in planning school-wide events.

SAC: Family and Community participation in several school based decisions and events.