
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Punta Gorda Middle School

1001 EDUCATION AVE, Punta Gorda, FL 33950

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

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.

Punta Gorda Middle School Mission Statement:

Relentlessly pursuing academic and personal growth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Punta Gorda Middle School Vision Statement

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

School Leadership Team, 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
Davis, Samuel	Principal	Mr. Davis is responsible for setting the school's Mission/Vision and creating systems/structures which support them. Mr. Davis establishes high academic achievement and focuses on the creation of positive learning and working environments for all stakeholders. As the main spokesperson for the campus and is responsible for communicating school information with the Punta Gorda School community. Mr. Davis is the evaluating administrator for the Science and Social Studies Department, oversees school budget and leads the school's administrative team.
McLain, Renee	Assistant Principal	Renee McLain is the assistant principal for facilities and is the administrative leader of our ESE programs. She oversees all issues related to school safety, including the scheduling and carrying out of all fire, tornado and active assailant drills. She supervises and evaluates all of the custodial staff. She coordinates the scheduling of building maintenance and repairs and ensure proper upkeep of campus grounds. She is the administrative sponsor of our school's PBIIS (Positive Behavior Support) team. Ms. McLain also oversees all school activities including clubs and intramurals. She leads the paraprofessional staff and coordinates busses. Ms. McLain supervises the school inventory, including textbooks.
Woelke, Carol	Assistant Principal	Carol Woelke is the assistant principal of curriculum. She serves as the administrative leader for all ELA, Math and Intensive Reading and evaluates all instructional staff across these departments. She is responsible for designing, implementing and balancing a master schedule. She establishes the standardized testing schedules for progress monitoring, FSAA, ACCESS for ELL, and FSA. She creates and maintains the school calendar. Ms. Woelke serves as the district contact for Canvas implementation. She serves as the Coordinator of Credit Recovery
	Assistant Principal	Jon Hock is assistant principal for discipline. He handles all discipline for the school. He supervises the Deans of Students and school security officers. He serves as a liaison to the School Resource Officers and coordinates annual safety trainings. He is in charge of bullying investigations and the district bully cabinet files. He handles all reassignment requests and revocations. He serves as the liaison to the PTO and coordinate school volunteers.

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.

Input for the SIP was collected through conference with leadership team, Guidance, Instructional Coaches teaching staff and PTO president. School Advisory Council was provided an opportunity to provide input on the three goals and their implementation. Students feedback was collected in previous year survey. This information was synthesized into the 3 defined Areas of Focus.

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))

SIP action steps and focus areas will be monitored through a mid-year SIP review, weekly CORE team meetings, Climate and Culture Surveys (Beginning, middle and end of the year) and Focus Analytics data. This will include tracking defined intervention groups within the SWD, Black, Free/ Reduced and ELL subgroups on PM1,2 and 3; District Common Assessments and classroom grades.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	88%
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	84	116	87	287
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	117	102	238
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	46	48	102
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	79	94	190
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	107	98	270
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	96	73	279
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	53	60	170

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	84	142	138	364

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	1	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	7

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	95	75	84	254
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	117	113	259
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	69	101	207
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	113	85	246
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	67	114	224
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	87	85	231
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	55	81	184

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	63	119	135	317

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	3	18	7	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	15

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	75	84	254
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	117	113	259
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	69	101	207
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	113	85	246
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	67	114	224
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	87	85	231
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	55	81	184

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	63	119	135	317

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	3	18	7	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	15

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*	50			51			49		
ELA Learning Gains	41			46			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	28			34			38		
Math Achievement*	53			54			61		
Math Learning Gains	48			48			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35			34			40		
Science Achievement*	47			45			53		
Social Studies Achievement*	70			68			83		
Middle School Acceleration	62			62			59		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	43			64			43		

* 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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	40	Yes	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)

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	50	41	28	53	48	35	47	70	62			43
SWD	20	28	20	25	36	28	20	35	42			
ELL	28	47	36	29	41	29	18	54				43
AMI												
ASN	69	40		88	81							
BLK	33	31	24	35	35	32	31	39	24			
HSP	42	40	36	40	42	36	39	69	62			
MUL	49	39	13	49	52	39	42	66	58			
PAC												
WHT	53	43	28	58	50	35	52	73	66			
FRL	40	35	28	44	40	32	36	60	47			

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	51	46	34	54	48	34	45	68	62			64
SWD	19	33	29	24	34	30	24	32	33			
ELL	28	37	46	30	46	38						64
AMI												
ASN				70	70							
BLK	34	33	35	44	40	28	22	58	42			
HSP	48	42	27	50	46	34	54	59	70			
MUL	47	41	20	52	42	24	47	52	50			
PAC												
WHT	54	49	37	56	49	36	46	73	61			
FRL	45	44	35	47	43	35	40	58	51			

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	49	45	38	61	52	40	53	83	59			43
SWD	21	33	31	29	41	43	21	53	36			
ELL	45	71	71	52	41	7						43
AMI												
ASN	73	55		95	82		70					
BLK	40	40	32	44	37	34	27	88				
HSP	43	47	45	53	49	35	45	87	46			
MUL	53	66	54	60	52	38	74	80	81			
PAC												
WHT	50	43	37	63	53	41	55	82	60			
FRL	41	42	35	53	49	41	47	80	47			

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.

State Science Assessment produced the lowest score at 43% proficient for the 2022-23 school year. Contributing factors include the maintenance of 6th and 7th grade standards through the 8th grade year. Additionally, the quality of Tier 1 instruction and alignment to standard may be a significant factor when Science Score is compared to 47% proficiency in ELA and 51% proficiency in Mathematics.

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

ELL student proficiency dropped from 28% achievement in 21-22 Federal Indicator to 9% proficiency 22-23 Federal Indicator. A contributor would be the loss of ELL teacher midway through the year. More critical, however, may be the drop for SWD subgroup from 20% proficient in 21-22 to 19% proficient in 22-23. While this is only a 1% drop, this represents (if counted) the 4th year below 41% and the only ESSA subgroup to have 1 consecutive year below 32%. Lack of quality instruction in ESE classrooms, Para Shortages and poor Campus Climate and Culture contributed to the drop in ESE Federal Indicators.

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.

8th grade math showed the greatest gap when compared to state results with school reaching 36% proficiency in 8th grade compared to 55 % statewide for the same grades level. In addition to 8th grade level 1 and 2 math students, lack of interventions and supports for this group contributed to the gap along with the attendance and behavior rates of 8th grade group.

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

7th grade math showed an increase from 51% to 61% proficiency on the 2023 assessment. This increase is a result of a decrease in student behavior incidents as well as professional development and teacher consistency.

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

Student attendance rate is one area of concern, in particular grade 6. In grade 6, the absences for 95 students totaled 110% or more days compared to 74 in grade 7 and 85 students grade 8. The second area of concern is student behavior incidents resulting in suspension. In grade 7, 117 students received one or more suspensions, with grade 6 having 69 students receiving one or more suspensions. Although this is an additional concern, it is also a direct correlation to attendance.

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

- 1-Increase proficiency of SWD ESSA subgroup.
- 2-Increase proficiency of ELL ESSA subgroup
- 3-Increase proficiency on Statewide Science Assessment.

4-Create a positive learning environment resulting in an increase of student attendance and reduction in suspension rates.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Our areas of focus will be to create a positive School Culture resulting in an increase of student attendance and reduction in suspension rates. This will increase Learning gains for all subgroups below 41% on Federal Indicator.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall school culture has shown quantifiable evidence of degradation with a school total of 3602 referrals generated from 579 students in the 2022-23 school year. In-school and out-of-school suspensions resulted in 3,151 days of lost instruction. We will reduce the overall referral rate by 25% and decrease the total number of suspensions days by 30% during the 2023-24 school year. Additionally, average daily attendance in 2022-23 for all students was 91.7% with 6th grade students showing the greatest number of absences with -0.57% below the overall baseline. We will decrease overall attendance rates by 3% and increase 6th grade attendance to within 0.3% of overall baseline.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor and adjust based on data from School Climate and Culture Survey to be collected from all staff in pre-school week, mid-year and post planning. Discipline data will be monitored in Focus Analytics at the end at Progress Report and the end of each Nine Weeks. Attendance will be monitored through average daily attendance reported in Focus Analytics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samuel Davis (samuel.davis@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 continue to be our evidence based intervention 2023-24. Additionally, we will implement multiple teacher and student incentive centered on reinforcing positive behavior and increasing student's connection to the campus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS is a strong evidence based strategy that is in the process of becoming embedded in the culture of the campus.

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.

Meet with PBIS Team to outline initiatives focused on behavior, attendance and sense of belonging.

Person Responsible: Renee McLain (renee.mclain@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: August 30th

Collect Climate and Culture Survey data from all staff as baseline in pre-plan. Follow up at mid-year to make adjustments and wrap up with end -of-year survey to gauge success.

Person Responsible: Samuel Davis (samuel.davis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Pre-School week, mid-year and end-of-year

Continue implementation of Referral Step System beginning at preplan training.

Person Responsible: Renee McLain (renee.mclain@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Pre-school week and ongoing.

Provide professional development on student behavior (ABCs of student behavior) and de-escalation training for all staff. We will monitor academic and Discipline data for Essa Subgroups (SWD, ELL, F&R and African American) throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Samuel Davis (samuel.davis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Pre-school week and staff meetings throughout the first semester.

We will implement multiple teacher and student incentive centered on reinforcing positive behavior and increasing student's connection to the campus.

Person Responsible: Samuel Davis (samuel.davis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Beginning August 2023. Ongoing through June 2024

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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 area of focus is to increase the proficiency and Learning Gains of Students with Disabilities, ELL, Black and Economically Disadvantaged ESSA components.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD subgroup dropped from 20% proficient in 21-22 to 19% proficient in 22-23. While this is only a 1% drop, this represents (if counted) the 4th year below 41% and the only ESSA subgroup to have 1 consecutive year below 32%. We will increase proficiency in all SWD ESSA components by 10% with additional 10% gain through focus on Learning Gains for each subgroup.

Monitoring:

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

Focus area will be monitored through Read 180, classroom assessments, PM1, PM2 and district progress monitoring assessment for each subgroup's ESSA component.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samuel Davis (samuel.davis@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.)

Differentiated and small group instruction. Incentivization of performance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated and small group instruction will better position teachers to capture daily learning gaps. ESSA subgroups will be identified in each competent of ESSA score and teachers will track these students progress while focusing on acquisition of content 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 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.

Identify the actual students contributing to each component of ESSA and share these groups with teachers.

Person Responsible: Carol Woelke (carol.woelke@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: August 30th

Identified student groups will be incentivized through PBIS Incentives Team on PM1, PM2 and Critical district assessments.

Person Responsible: Samuel Davis (samuel.davis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: September 1st and ongoing

Math and Reading Coaches will provide additional support and tracking for Identified SWD in Science, Civics and Algebra.

Person Responsible: Samuel Davis (samuel.davis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: September 1st and ongoing

We will provide professional development centered on differentiated and small group instruction in order to capture daily learning gaps.

Person Responsible: Samuel Davis (samuel.davis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: November 2023

ESSA subgroups will be identified in each competent of ESSA score. These groups will be incentivized for improvement on PM1, PM2 and critical district assessments.

Person Responsible: Samuel Davis (samuel.davis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: December and Ongoing

#3. 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.

Our area of focus is to increase proficiency on the Statewide Science Assessment. In addition, we will focus on increasing the proficiency of our ELL and SWD subgroups Statewide Science Assessment outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall scores on State Science Assessment will increased from 43% proficient the previous year to 47% proficient on the 23-24 assessment. Students with Disabilities will increase in the Science component from 20% proficient to 30% proficient and ELL student will increase from 18% proficient to 28% proficient in 23-23.

Monitoring:

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

Analysis of the weekly walkthrough form data will occur during CORE team meetings. Science proficiency data, Learning Gains, and Learning Gains for the lowest 25% will be monitored with adjustments made following District Formative Assessments, DRI, PM1 and PM2. ESE and ELL students in 8th grade science will be monitored on these same components.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samuel Davis (samuel.davis@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.)

Backward planning and alignment of standards and instruction to improve the quality of tier one instruction with focus on small group, differentiated instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increased collaboration (With Backward planning from standard and Alignment of instruction to standards) will provide all science teacher the opportunity to better align instructional plans to the true depth of knowledge of the standards. As there are typically trailing standards and gaps that exist from 6th and 7th grade standards, 8th grade teachers will need to differentiate which students need additional instruction on which standards and a be comfortable with small group strategies to address these gaps.

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.

Identify historically trailing 6th and 7th grade standards and establish reteaching opportunities within 8th grade curriculum.

Person Responsible: Samuel Davis (samuel.davis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: October 30th

Identify ELL and SWD student in 8th grade science. These student will be tracked and supported by Math Coach.

Person Responsible: Samuel Davis (samuel.davis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

In cooperation with the district pacing guide will be adjusted to created review time prior to the Statewide Science Assessment. Science teachers will use this extended review time to differentiate instruction to address trailing standards.

Person Responsible: Samuel Davis (samuel.davis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: March 30th 2024

ELL and SWD students will be incentivized for increased proficiency on PM1 and PM2 assessments.

Person Responsible: Samuel Davis (samuel.davis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: August 22, 2023- Ongoing

Science Boot Camp prior to state Assessment will be pushed out by the eighth grade science team

Person Responsible: Samuel Davis (samuel.davis@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: April 2023

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).

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. SIP funds will be used to support Positive Culture Initiatives on campus.