

Charlotte County Public Schools

Charlotte Harbor School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)



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.

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

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
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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)	
School Grades History	
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		

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			
	K	1	2	3

--

--

--

--

--

--

--

--

[illegible][illegible]

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

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:

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

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

#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.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure

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 Statewide Plan

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