Charlotte Harbor School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
ambitious
mission
family and community involvement
school improvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
success
areas of focus
instruction
needs assessment
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
resources
growth

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Charlotte Harbor School

22450 HANCOCK AVE, Port Charlotte, FL 33980

http://yourcharlotteschools.net/chc

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/10/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 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.
Underhill, Eliot	Dean	As the Dean, Eliot Underhill oversees the five step disciplinary system utilized by the school to both maintain a stable academic environment and support the needs of students with emotional and behavioral challenges.
Melvin, Daniel	Teacher, ESE	In addition to teaching, Daniel Melvin is the PBIS Facilitator, and has the responsibility of managing monthly meetings, organizing fundraisers for PBIS, and promoting a positive culture on campus.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school advisory council meets monthly. The council includes: administration, teachers, support staff, and student families. Administration sends out an automated call to alert the stakeholders of an

upcoming SAC meeting a week prior to the meeting date. The school improvement plan draft is presented and discussed at the meeting for approval and possible revisions if deemed necessary.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Our MTSS and Program planner meetings serve as opportunities to review data related to academic and social support for our students experiencing difficulties. The data utilized includes the Early Warning Systems data, FAST results, and district required progress monitoring.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2020-21: MAINTAINING 2018-19: COMMENDABLE 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: UNSATISFACTORY
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days		1	2	3	6	4	1	7	6	6	36
One or more suspensions		1	1	2	8	5	4	6	9	6	42
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		0	0	0	4	4	0	5	6	2	21
Course failure in Math		0	0	0	4	4	1	7	7	5	28
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment		0	0	0	0	3	1	3	3	3	13
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment		0	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	2	10
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Note: the above table has values arranged under grade columns K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8. For "Absent 10% or more days": K blank, 1, 2, 3, 6, 4, 1, 7, 6, 6 — Total 36.

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	2	6	4	1	7	7	6	35

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	0	3	2	3	5	5	4	8	44
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	2	3	3	4	5	7	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	5	3	13
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	1	1	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	4	4	6	3	5	3	4	10	68

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	3	3	4	5	5	6	8	48

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	0	3	2	3	5	5	4	8	31
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	2	3	3	4	5	7	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	5	3	13
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	1	1	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	4	4	6	3	5	3	4	10	40

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	3	3	4	5	5	6	8	37

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	11	50	53	16	49	55	49		
ELA Learning Gains				19			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	12	41	55	25	34	42	52		
Math Learning Gains				37			71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	14	50	52	4	46	54	45		
Social Studies Achievement*	22	50	68	18	55	59	20		
Middle School Acceleration		53	70		48	51			
Graduation Rate		66	74		36	50			
College and Career Acceleration		26	53		55	70			
ELP Progress			55		22	70			

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	15
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	59
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	86
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	20
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	119
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	86
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	16	Yes	4	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	0	Yes	1	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	18	Yes	2	2
FRL	11	Yes	2	2

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	21	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	27	Yes	1	1
FRL	20	Yes	1	1

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	11			12			14	22				
SWD	12			15			14	22			4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	0										1	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	13			19			21				3	
FRL	11			8			7	17			4	

	2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	16	19		25	37		4	18				
SWD	18	19		27	37		5	20				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	23	25		36	43		8					
FRL	17	17		25	32		7					

	2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	49	69		52	71		45	20				
SWD	49	69		52	71		45	20				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	20											
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56	67		59	71		57					
FRL	48	74		53	75		43					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	*	51%	*	50%	*
05	2023 - Spring	*	58%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	53%	*	47%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	47%	*	47%	*
09	2023 - Spring	*	49%	*	48%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	58%	*
06	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	47%	*
03	2023 - Spring	20%	56%	-36%	50%	-30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	55%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	66%	*	48%	*
03	2023 - Spring	*	64%	*	59%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	62%	*	61%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	43%	*	55%	*
05	2023 - Spring	*	54%	*	55%	*

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	*	45%	*	44%	*

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	50%	*

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	67%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	70%	*	66%	*

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	63%	*

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Science showed the lowest performance with 73.7% of students tested testing at a Level 1. No students tested above a Level 3 in Science. The science teacher left Charlotte Harbor Center during the school year, leaving students with a permanent substitute teacher for the third and fourth quarter.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Science showed the greatest decline from only 20% of students testing at a Level 1 in the 2021-2022 school year. This means the number of students testing at a Level 1 increased by 53.7%. The 2018-2019 school year however, has similar results with 60% of students testing in Level 1 and no students testing above a Level 3. An influx of students, many of whom were significantly below grade level, as well as the science teacher leaving halfway through the school year and being replaced by a permanent substitute are considered the major factors surrounding this decline.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Science has the greatest performance gap. Statewide, 12.3% of students receive Level 4 and 13.6% receive Level 5. Charlotte Harbor Center has no students above a Level 3 and has 73.7% of students testing at Level 1. The state average for Level 1 is 21.7%.

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

Every academic subject showed a decline in performance. We are currently in the process of meeting the necessary changes of eligibility requirements for several students for access point instruction. These students were previously receiving instruction in access points instruction, but legislative changes required a move to regular standard instruction and testing.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Two factors in our Early Warning System data that are of concern are absences and suspensions. Our population of students enrolled is 127. Last year, 42 students have been suspended and 36 were absent for 10 or more days. That means roughly 33% of students experienced a suspension and 28% of students were absent 10 or more days. Calculating all of classroom hours lost per student for not attending either because of suspension or other reasons comes to 1,563 classroom hours.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Reducing lost classroom time.
Science Achievement.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Science was our lowest performing subject area, with 73.7% of students testing at a Level 1 and no students tested above a Level 3.

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

50% of 8th graders will score a Level 2 or higher on their Science state assessments.

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

District formative and progress monitoring assessments. The science teachers, assistant principal of curriculum, and C&I will meet after assessments to discuss the progress of science students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jon Arritt (jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Science lessons will include inquiry-based learning, direct and explicit vocabulary instruction, and integration of reading and writing.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Many students are below grade level in science, and thus lack the necessary background knowledge to understand the material. By incorporating instruction related to reading, writing, and vocabulary into science, students would be able to better understand the content and be more engaged. A study published in the International Science Journal of Education showed that 43% of students who received Literacy-embedded Science instruction scored higher than students that received standard science instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

The new science teacher will be met with to discuss utilizing a literacy embedded curriculum for science

Person Responsible: Jon Arritt (jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: No later than 8/10/2023

Science teacher will provide inquiry-based learning, direct and explicit vocabulary instruction, and integration of reading and writing, on a weekly basis

Person Responsible: Jon Arritt (jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Weekly Basis.

Science teacher will discuss progress of using Literacy embedded science instruction with students at weekly MTSS meetings

Person Responsible: Jon Arritt (jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Weekly

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

All of our students fall under the category of "Students with Disabilities." As a result, it is vital to make sure they are in regular attendance of their classrooms to receive instruction. The early warning systems has shown a significant portion of students get suspended or are absent for longer than 10 days. The total amount of classroom hours lost last school year due to absences and suspensions comes to 1,563 classroom hours.

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

Reduce the number of lost classroom hours to less than 1,000.

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

1. Weekly MTSS Meetings to discuss how students struggling with behavior issues can be better supported.
2. Weekly SAT Meetings to discuss students that are frequently absent.
3. Homeroom teachers calling home if a student has been absent for 3 consecutive days.
4. Data collected from ISS to calculate the amount of hours where academic work took place.
5. Monthly review of focus attendance and out of school suspension data in staff meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eliot Underhill (eliot.underhill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Incorporating Navigate 360 into the classrooms and discipline procedures on SANDS Campus to teach positive replacement behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A study performed by the Institute for Education Sciences during the 2018-19 academic year found that chronic absenteeism declined when reaching out to families was done with high fidelity. Considering suspensions make up the bulk of student's missed class time, implementing alternatives to suspension to keep students in school is a logical step to increase instructional time.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Implementation of the 5 Steps Discipline Procedure with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Eliot Underhill (eliot.underhill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Creation of an In-School Suspension.

Person Responsible: Eliot Underhill (eliot.underhill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: No later than September 1st.

Meeting with teachers and social worker to discuss expectations in regards to students that are frequently absent to insure alliance with state statutes.

Person Responsible: Eliot Underhill (eliot.underhill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: No later than August 10th.

Introducing Navigate 360 to teachers and support staff.

Person Responsible: Eliot Underhill (eliot.underhill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: No later than August 10th.

Use Navigate 360 as part of step 2 in the discipline procedures.

Person Responsible: Eliot Underhill (eliot.underhill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Charlotte Harbor Center can be a challenging place to work given the special accommodations and modifications that must be provided to every student. As a result, it is important to ensure that teachers and staff feel valued.

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

Staff Shout Outs will be implemented with fidelity and announced on a monthly basis through school email.

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

Shout Outs will be documented monthly to see how often they are written to determine staff engagement and if the content produced on them is positive.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Melvin (daniel.melvin@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

PBIS will use Staff Shout-Outs to promote a positive and supportive environment for teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Staff Shout Outs would be an effective means to celebrate the contributions of staff members on a regular basis to let them know they are valued and appreciated. Doing this will help teachers to build a positive relationship with their colleagues and support staff, which will encourage them to want to remain employed at Charlotte Harbor Center.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Distribute and collect Staff Shout Outs on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible: Daniel Melvin (daniel.melvin@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Staff Shout Outs will be highlighted monthly in an email to all staff

Person Responsible: Daniel Melvin (daniel.melvin@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Staff Shout Outs will be read weekly on the school news.

Person Responsible: Daniel Melvin (daniel.melvin@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Staff will be made aware of staff shout out policy through email and staff meetings.

Person Responsible: Daniel Melvin (daniel.melvin@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The projected ELA gains for the 2022-2023 school year were 21%, which falls into the unsatisfactory range. 50% is the minimum percentage of gains necessary to fall into the commendable range.

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

ELA gains will increase by 29% by the end of the school year to reach commendable status.

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

FAST testing and district-based assessments through SAVVAS will be used to monitor the progress of English and Language Arts students in order to achieve their academic goals. Administrators will conduct walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of literature logs and instructional conversations. Logs will be shared with the parents on a daily basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jon Arritt (jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The strategy implemented to show improvement in ELA 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 Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy is designed to improve reading and comprehension skills, both of which are essential to mastery of several of content areas associated with ELA standards.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Literacy Leadership will introduce the strategy of Instructional Conversations and Literature Logs to teachers. Teachers will meet weekly to discuss the effectiveness of the strategies.

Person Responsible: Jon Arritt (jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Prior to August 10th.

Teachers will implement the strategy and utilize it in activities at least once a week with students.

Person Responsible: Jon Arritt (jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

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.

Person Responsible: Eliot Underhill (eliot.underhill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Weekly.

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In the 2022-2023 school year, the projected learning gains for Mathematics is 39%. 50% is what is necessary to reach a rating of commendable.

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

Mathematics learning gains will increase by a minimum of 11%.

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

FAST progress monitoring assessments will be used, as well as district-based assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jon Arritt (jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teaching students to use visual representations to solve problems. Examples include strip diagrams, percent bars, and schematic diagrams.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Institute for Educational Sciences has determined this to be an effective strategy as it teaches a useful skill to make abstract concepts in algebra more comprehensible for students. Multiple studies have been done comparing students that were taught this strategy to those that were not, and the results suggested a statistically significant improvement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Information regarding the strategy will be provided to mathematics teachers.

Person Responsible: Jon Arritt (jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Prior to August 10th.

Mathematics teachers will implement the strategy in the classroom with students.

Person Responsible: Jon Arritt (jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Weekly MTSS meetings will review the progress of students in classrooms utilizing the strategy.

Person Responsible: Eliot Underhill (eliot.underhill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

<div style="background-color:#2d2d6e; color:white; text-align:center; padding:10px">

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

</div>

Schoolwide Improvement funds are allocated to schools annually as a per pupil allocation based on Survey 3 FTE data. Supplemental federal funds are allocated to schools as requested by school leadership and based on need. Schools complete the Federal Programs Consultation Survey to request funds needed to support their school improvement areas of focus. The federal programs team reviews each request and approves on an individual basis giving priority to schools designated as CSI, TSI, and ATSI respectively.

School improvement funds will be used to purchase instructional supplies and materials related to the SIP Areas of Focus.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

N/A

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes