

Charlotte County Public Schools

Port Charlotte High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Port Charlotte High School

18200 COCHRAN BLVD, Port Charlotte, FL 33948

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/pchs>

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.

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, 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
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 Guidance Professional Supervisor Master Schedule Lead Partnership and Performance Council (PPC) Co-Chair 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)
McIntosh, Daniel	Assistant Principal	Facilities/Activities Administrative Coverage Capital Outlay Custodial Services (Neff) Inventory Master Calendar NET Teacher Professional Development/Professional Learning Community (PLC) Lead Technology Textbooks Underclassmen Awards
Curtis, Paul	Assistant Principal	Student Services/ESE Athletics Attendance Career and College Readiness (CACR) Lead True North Logic Deans Destination Graduation Discipline

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Emergency/Crisis Plans ESE Lead Contact Paraprofessionals Registration/Reassignments/Withdrawals Security SERT Supervisor Support PPC RTI / MTSS / Threat Assessments Textbooks

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.

- Brandi Eberhardt - Reading Coach
- Rosalyn Gauthier - ESE
- Donna Barrett - Community Partner
- Louis Long - School Leader
- Natasha Forbus - Curriculum & Testing Admin/ SAC Chair
- Paul Curtis - Student Services/ESE Admin
- Daniel McIntosh - Facilities/Activities Admin
- Jill McBee - Classroom Teacher
- Xavier Gauthier - Student

All stakeholders were invited to (and attended) a virtual meeting to discuss student performance/ achievement for the 22-23 school year. At this meeting, the team discussed our greatest areas of need and how we plan to improve in the 23-24 school year. These members have agreed to be members of our SAC committee and will continue to take part in monitoring the plan throughout the school year on a monthly basis.

Students will continue to be surveyed throughout the school year to provide feedback.

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))

- We will monitor the achievement scores for every progress monitoring opportunity (DFA, DRI, PM).
- We have weekly admin meetings scheduled to discuss classroom walk-through data regarding instructional practice.
- Attendance team meets weekly to discuss attendance rates.
- We will meet monthly with the SAC committee to discuss progress towards meeting our goals.

Demographic Data

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	47%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
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)	
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	424
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	254
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	485
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	463
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	318

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	585

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	0	0	49
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

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

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.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	39			39			42		
ELA Learning Gains	39			38			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	29			28			29		
Math Achievement*	31			23			43		
Math Learning Gains	28			22			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35			23			38		
Science Achievement*	60			49			67		

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement*	60			53			68		
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate	91			91			91		
College and Career Acceleration	69			71			40		
ELP Progress	38			55			46		

* 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	519
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	91

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	35	Yes	3	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	71			

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%
BLK	44			
HSP	44			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	42			

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)

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	39	39	29	31	28	35	60	60		91	69	38
SWD	21	30	23	15	27	30	45	37		86	36	
ELL	26	38	20	19	39	60	50			88	79	38
AMI												
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	29
MUL	39	25		33	22	30	63	72		91	86	
PAC												
WHT	41	40	35	35	28	31	63	61		90	68	
FRL	31	32	29	27	25	25	55	55		89	66	33

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	39	38	28	23	22	23	49	53		91	71	55
SWD	22	33	27	20	24	27	35	37		84	38	
ELL	8	30		15	19					92	73	55

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
AMI												
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	
PAC												
WHT	39	37	27	23	21	22	50	60		89	75	
FRL	33	35	27	19	19	16	42	40		89	68	50

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	42	38	29	43	47	38	67	68		91	40	46
SWD	21	29	30	23	31		38	41		88	18	
ELL	24	23	23	33	45		38					46
AMI												
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	46
MUL	38	32		26	36		71	71		94	33	
PAC												
WHT	45	39	28	49	54	45	70	73		91	39	
FRL	35	35	27	35	44	38	60	64		88	38	36

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

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.

ELA Achievement showed the lowest performance.

For the first half of the school year we had a long term substitute in our 9th grade ELA course. We were unable to find a qualified teacher until right before Christmas break. According to our Early Warning Signs, 33% of our 9th and 10th grade students have a substantial reading deficiency.

One other factor that could have contributed to the lower scores, would be that this is the first year having administered the new FAST ELA assessment.

Lastly, students were out of school for three weeks due to Hurricane Ian. This impacted student performance even after students reported back to school, as many families were displaced or dealing with damaged homes.

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

Social Studies Achievement show the greatest decline from last year. US History scores declined by 12 points from the 2022 to the 2023 school year.

All teachers in this specific content area were new to our school or to the content area itself.

Students were out of school for three weeks due to Hurricane Ian. This impacted student performance even after students reported back to school as many families were displaced or dealing with damaged homes. Several of our teachers had a difficult time keeping students on pace to be best prepared for the EOC.

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.

Social Studies Achievement had the greatest gap from the state average (-15 points).

All teachers in this specific content area were new to our school or to the content area itself.

Students were out of school for three weeks due to Hurricane Ian. This impacted student performance even after students reported back to school as many families were displaced or dealing with damaged homes. Several of our teachers had a difficult time keeping students on pace to be best prepared for the EOC.

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

Math Achievement showed the most improvement (+21 points).

The following factors made the greatest impact:

1. Utilizing math coach to model lessons for teachers
2. Intentional scheduling of students that had not passed the Algebra 1 EOC.

3. High impact teachers placed into tested areas
4. Foundation math course - High Dosage tutoring for level 2 freshmen students taking Algebra 1.

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

Based on the Early Warning Systems, our two largest areas of concern are student attendance and FAST ELA Assessment scores.

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

- Instructional Planning & Pacing (Focus on USH)
- Instructional Methods/Professional Development
- Student Attendance
- Monitoring growth
- Student Performance

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 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.

For the 2021-2022 SY 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 kept the SWD subgroup within the TSI designation. This is still the score we need to improve from as the 2022-2023 SY index scores have no impact on our TSI 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 current achievement scores available to our school show the following:

ELA -25 (+4)
 Math - 38 (+23)
 Science - 51 (+6)
 Social Studies - 36 (-1)

Overall - 38%

Our overall score (Including learning gains, CACR, & Graduation) will not be available until midyear, but achievement scores show an upward trend.

Measurable Outcome:

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

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

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.

- During our weekly academic based Admin meetings we will review and discuss any new data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@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.)

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 FAST math assessment have been placed in a

foundational math course. Within this course students are receiving high dosage tutoring in Algebra 1 content.

Instructional Coaching for Math and ELA teachers, specific to meeting individual IEP needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

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.

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

Person Responsible: Daniel McIntosh (daniel.mcintosh@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: year long

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

Person Responsible: Daniel McIntosh (daniel.mcintosh@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Last week of August

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)

By When: First week of September

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

According to the Early Warning Systems report, more than a quarter of each grade level have below a 90% attendance rate.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our schoolwide goal is to maintain a 93% attendance rate.

Monitoring:

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

-The attendance team will meet weekly to monitor students with frequent tardies/absences. This team will use FOCUS analytics to monitor the weekly attendance percentage.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Curtis (paul.curtis@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 Strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Promote attendance, celebrate attendance improvements, motivate students to attend school (all day).

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.

Create a schedule of quarterly rewards for a specified percentage of school attendance as a requirement.

Person Responsible: Paul Curtis (paul.curtis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: August 9, 2023

Reward perfect (Week-long) attendance for 1 staff & 1 student.

Person Responsible: Lou Long (louis.long@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Every Friday

Attendance team meets to discuss students standing out for poor attendance.

Person Responsible: Paul Curtis (paul.curtis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Every Thursday

MTSS meetings address our students with chronic absenteeism. Decide on best interventions for individual students. Continue to monitor students at follow up meeting. Discuss effectiveness of interventions.

Person Responsible: Paul Curtis (paul.curtis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Bi-Weekly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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.

Our areas of growth/achievement as well as our areas of loss, will both benefit from instructional coaching and professional learning. This intervention will make a large impact on our overall success. It is our direct connection to supporting instructional staff in areas of need.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will grow by 45 points, making us an "A" school for the 2023-2024 SY.

Monitoring:

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

- Will monitor failure lists during each grading period
- Will monitor completion rates for DFAs, DRIs, PM
- Will monitor behavior referrals
- Will monitor data from Admin walk-through tool

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natasha Forbus (natasha.forbus@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.)

Instructional coaching is the evidence based intervention for this area of focus. The feedback that admin receives from the academic coaches will lead to specific professional development opportunities throughout the school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Instructional practice should be an area of focus every school year. All staff can benefit from learning new methods of teaching.

This year, we do have new teachers on staff. Some are new to the high school level or their specific content area, and some are new to teaching all together.

Instructional coaching and professional learning opportunities are available for both the new and veteran teaching staff. They can continue to be provided and built upon throughout the school year. This is the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

Teachers will submit a four week instructional plan. This will identify units being taught, standards within each unit, and any major assignments or assessments that will support and assess student mastery.

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

By When: Grading periods (Progress report & Report Cards)

Discuss teachers that need to complete instructional Walks followed by debriefs with instructional coaches/admin. These will be teachers that have requested support, and those that admin feel need the support.

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

By When: Weekly admin meeting

Will request coaches to model whole class and small group instruction that promotes student engagement.

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

By When: At weekly meeting with instructional coaches.

95% participation in all progress monitoring (DFA/DRI/PM)

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

By When: Each testing window

Admin team will review USH data after each progress monitoring opportunity. Will identify specific goals in between progress monitoring windows.

Person Responsible: Lou Long (louis.long@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: After each assessment window (DRI/DFA)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

We have hired 8 new teachers for the 23/24 school year.
We are placing several new expectations and regulations on our staff.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will retain 100% of our staff members for the school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will send quarterly climate surveys to staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lou Long (louis.long@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.)

Create small, personalized communities to facilitate monitoring and support

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We can provide support based on specific needs.

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.

Acknowledging years of service at PCHS with a pinning ceremony.

Person Responsible: Lou Long (louis.long@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: End of School year

Celebrating school/teachers for meeting instructional goals.

Person Responsible: Lou Long (louis.long@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Monthly at faculty meetings

Providing support during personal hardships.

Person Responsible: Lou Long (louis.long@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: on going

Reimbursing staff for cost of subject area testing when needs arise in specific areas.

Person Responsible: Lou Long (louis.long@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Once provided with receipt of payment for exam.

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).

The process to review how school improvement funding is both allocated appropriately and ensure that this allocation is based on needs is through three leadership organizations that meet regularly throughout the school year. The PPC (Partnership Performance Council) meets monthly. The PPC has representation from each of the four core areas, and constantly provides feedback to the administrative team on how internal and district funds are allocated and spent throughout the school year in support of our SWD (Students With Disability) population. The SIP Team meets as needed throughout the school year. This team provided input this summer on goals to improve our TSI designation for SWD's, provide input on how allocated funds are spent to support our SWD population, and assist with progress monitoring data review to assist the administrative team adjust our SIP as needed. Our School Advisory Council (SAC) meets monthly. This organization assists the administrative team in allocating funds to support the different parts of the SIP. The SAC, based on data provided by the administrative team, can adjust and amend allocation funding as needed.

Funding to remove the TSI designation will include:

- In all core areas staff will be asked to obtain their certification in ESE. The cost of obtaining certifications may come from SIP funding.
- We will continue to increase the number of instructional staff that are certified as ACT Mastery Teachers. This will support students, including our ESE population, that are in need of concordance score for state testing requirements. The cost for training may come from SIP funding.
- The improvement of attendance of our ESE student population is important to increase instructional time. The cost of PBIS attendance interventions may come from SIP funds.
- Professional Development (PD) for our ESE staff in the area of instructional design and implementation will also improve student outcomes. PD may be provided to our instructional team in our Communication Disorder (CD), Emotional Behavioral Disorder (EBD), and Transitional/Functional Units. The cost of this PD may come from SIP funding.

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