

Charlotte County Public Schools

L. A. Ainger Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

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

[illegible]

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.

To promote TRUST, RESPECT, ACHIEVEMENT, CHARACTER, and KINDNESS in a positive culture that inspires SUCCESS for ALL.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Student Success!

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
Fourman, Bruce	Principal	
Davel, Nicole	Assistant Principal	
Pulliam, Matina	Assistant Principal	

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.

Stakeholders were invited to school during the summer to review data and discuss the SIP plan. Goals were made by administration, presented to the stakeholders, then adjusted based off the collaboration. During the school year, we will follow the same process of having specific meetings during SAC meetings that are to discuss data and the progress of SIP goals. We will also meet with Student Council students twice a year to review our SIP progress. During that time, adjustments will be made to ensure that we are meeting the needs of students.

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))

The administration team will conduct walkthroughs while looking for SIP specific interventions. Administration will collect data using a google sheet and share the data with teachers quarterly. Regular collection of data from F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring opportunities as well as READ/Math 180 and System 44 data for teachers to make instructional decisions to fill gaps in student knowledge and understanding. Data will be reviewed in PLC meetings after BOY and MOY. Data meetings for teachers to collaborate with administration regarding instructional methods to help students improve their

academics with focus on the SIP specific goals. The SIP will be discussed monthly with the administration team to make sure that goals and interventions are being used in walk throughs and that assessment data is showing progress. The findings will be shared quarterly at SAC meetings and the SIP admins will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement.

For our 20-day Action Plan, we had data chats with PLC leaders about their subject. Then we had individual chats with each teacher to discuss their data. During the chats we discussed strengths and weaknesses combined with their personal feedback. With that information, we paired teachers to mentor each other.

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	19%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	81%
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: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

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	4	2	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4

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	0	48	43	62	153
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	18	64	92
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	18	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	30	51
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	37	54	119
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	39	43	123
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	28	37	54	119

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	32	32	56	120

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	4	2	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

f.5332 534.8365 Td(167 0.)976.2324

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	54			54			59		
ELA Learning Gains	48			53			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40			38			42		
Math Achievement*	62			66			71		
Math Learning Gains	60			54			78		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60			52			62		
Science Achievement*	56			53			61		
Social Studies Achievement*	74			78			75		
Middle School Acceleration	74			72			79		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* 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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	528
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
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	37	Yes	2	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	23	Yes	1	1
HSP	52			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	50			

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	54	48	40	62	60	60	56	74	74			
SWD	27	35	28	35	54	52	21	47				
ELL	48	36		45	48			91				
AMI												
ASN	64	70		82	80							
BLK	10			36								
HSP	51	43	36	48	49	45	41	78	75			
MUL	53	50		47	44							
PAC												
WHT	55	49	40	64	62	62	58	74	74			
FRL	44	45	35	50	54	62	41	66	55			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach. L25%	SS Ach.	MS Accel 58	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	54	53	38	66	54	52	53	78	72			
SWD	25	38	27	29	45	46	23	45	45			
ELL	41	73		41	56							
AMI												
ASN	64	60		55	40				82			
BLK												
HSP	50	56	33	60	52	48	32	64	74			
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	55	52	38	67	56	54	56	80	72			
FRL	41	45	34	52	53	58	42	69	63			

[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 Achievement was the lowest performance area. From 2022 to 2023 our students score went from a 56 to a 48. It is also the lowest performing area overall for achievement. The contributing factors include inconsistent staffing.

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

The greatest decline was our Middle School Acceleration with a loss of 10 points. Although we had a high passing rate in Geometry (100%), and Algebra 1 (83%), our overall rate went from a 74% to a 64%. Factors that impact this score include not having enough students enrolled in Algebra 1 for 8th grade out of those that qualified using their 7th grade math score of level 3, 4, and 5.

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.

Our Social Studies is 14 points higher in achievement compared to the state. We have two teachers that work closely together to collaborate on lessons and data. We also had a decrease of 10 points in math acceleration compared to the state. Levels 3-5 were placed in Algebra 1 last year without support. This year we have more Algebra classes and support (additional math class to deepen knowledge) built into some of the students schedules that were a low level 3 or that begin to struggle during the school year.

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

Social Studies showed the most improvement with an increase from 74 to 83 points. We had a new teacher that taught Civics this year. During the school year there were supports in place including a mentor teacher, district level professional development, and support within the school. The new teacher and veteran teacher worked together for a positive learning outcome for all students.

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

Based on the Early Warning System, students with two or more early warning indicators increased from 120 students to 176 students. In 21-22, 18% of students show two or more early warning indicators.



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.

#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.

By When: Weekly

There will be weekly drawings for students who did not receive any referrals. They will receive recognition and a reward for their positive behavior and good choices.

Person Responsible: Matina Pulliam (matina.pulliam@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Students that have 4 referrals or less will be invited to an after school social event.

Person Responsible: Matina Pulliam (matina.pulliam@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Monthly

PBIS plan created by the Administration and the PBIS team of selected staff members will be created and shared with students during the first week assembly. Staff will be presented the information during the first day back and then during staff meetings. Parents will be informed during the SAC/PTO meetings of plan, progress updates, and needs. Information can also be found in the Student/Faculty Handbook.

Person Responsible: Matina Pulliam (matina.pulliam@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Beginning of the year and Monthly

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.

During the first week of school, teachers that were not trained in Kagan were selected to attend the Kagan Cooperative Learning Day 1 Workshop. Benefits of Kagan include increased student achievement, reduce achievement gap, drop in discipline referrals, positive social skill development, and improved race relations.