

Sarasota County Schools

Sarasota Suncoast Academy



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Sarasota Suncoast Academy

8084 HAWKINS RD, Sarasota, FL 34241

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/suncoast

Demographics

Principal: Stacy Homan

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2004

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School KG-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2018-19 Title I School | No |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 30% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: A (79%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Sarasota Suncoast Academy

8084 HAWKINS RD, Sarasota, FL 34241

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/suncoast

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School KG-8 | No | 31% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | Yes | 20% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A | A | A | B |

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Sarasota Suncoast Academy is to integrate excellence in education, highly motivated and qualified teachers, deeply concerned and involved parents and a supportive community to provide students a superior learning opportunity. We will develop and reinforce a strong value system and a healthy work ethic that affords children the tools needed to succeed and contribute in the 21st century.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sarasota Suncoast Academy believes that all children are entitled to reach their fullest academic and social potential in a positive, respectful environment. The school community is dedicated to developing an interactive, social school environment that encourages growth and success in becoming a viable leader of their present and future community through the use of the Responsive Classroom approach.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|
| Crump, Steve | Principal | |
| Leinweber, Joshua | Principal | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 91 | 88 | 88 | 93 | 92 | 81 | 92 | 85 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 772 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 13 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

47

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/5/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 14 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 14 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 75% | 67% | 61% | 80% | 69% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 60% | 60% | 59% | 62% | 62% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 47% | 52% | 54% | 59% | 58% | 51% |
| Math Achievement | 73% | 70% | 62% | 78% | 68% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 63% | 65% | 59% | 59% | 64% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 49% | 55% | 52% | 52% | 57% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 75% | 63% | 56% | 64% | 58% | 53% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 0% | 88% | 78% | 0% | 85% | 75% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 91 (0) | 88 (0) | 88 (0) | 93 (0) | 92 (0) | 81 (0) | 92 (0) | 85 (0) | 62 (0) | 772 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 (9) | 13 (6) | 5 (5) | 9 (8) | 3 (14) | 4 (10) | 3 (13) | 11 (0) | 4 (0) | 52 (65) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (3) | 0 (2) | 0 (1) | 1 (2) | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 2 (3) | 2 (0) | 1 (0) | 6 (12) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (2) | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (4) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (7) | 4 (6) | 5 (10) | 15 (8) | 11 (0) | 6 (0) | 42 (31) |

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 82% | 70% | 12% | 58% | 24% |
| | 2018 | 86% | 68% | 18% | 57% | 29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 82% | 67% | 15% | 58% | 24% |
| | 2018 | 85% | 67% | 18% | 56% | 29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 77% | 68% | 9% | 56% | 21% |
| | 2018 | 71% | 66% | 5% | 55% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 63% | 63% | 0% | 54% | 9% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 67% | 63% | 4% | 52% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 59% | 64% | -5% | 52% | 7% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 78% | 73% | 5% | 62% | 16% |
| | 2018 | 84% | 72% | 12% | 62% | 22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 76% | 72% | 4% | 64% | 12% |
| | 2018 | 79% | 71% | 8% | 62% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 59% | 70% | -11% | 60% | -1% |
| | 2018 | 61% | 72% | -11% | 61% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -20% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 71% | 67% | 4% | 55% | 16% |
| | 2018 | 72% | 66% | 6% | 52% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 82% | 73% | 9% | 54% | 28% |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 75% | 65% | 10% | 53% | 22% |
| | 2018 | 71% | 67% | 4% | 55% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | -71% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 |
| SWD | 38 | 41 | 42 | 45 | 59 | 53 | | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 51 | 28 | 67 | 49 | 38 | 67 | | | | |
| MUL | 74 | 43 | | 79 | 64 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | 63 | 55 | 74 | 65 | 49 | 75 | | | | |
| FRL | 60 | 45 | 32 | 65 | 54 | 46 | 73 | | | | |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 44 | 60 | 53 | 33 | 44 | 35 | | | | | |
| HSP | 76 | 68 | 64 | 71 | 48 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 92 | 60 | | 83 | 70 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | 61 | 59 | 76 | 58 | 36 | 76 | | | | |
| FRL | 75 | 59 | 52 | 60 | 47 | 33 | 66 | | | | |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 33 | 45 | 53 | 30 | 27 | 25 | 46 | | | | |
| HSP | 70 | 64 | | 81 | 50 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 73 | | | 91 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 82 | 63 | 61 | 77 | 60 | 57 | 68 | | | | |
| FRL | 76 | 65 | 56 | 76 | 57 | 56 | 56 | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 63 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 442 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 46 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Native American Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 51 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 65 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 65 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 54 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

5th Grade math showed the lowest performance for the 2018-2019 school year. We believe there were multiple factors contributing to this performance including two new 5th grade teachers, and for one teacher it was her first year teaching.

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

5th Grade math, same cohort, showed the greatest decline for the 2018-2019 school year. This is the same area that also had the lowest performance for the 2018-2019 school year. We believe a significant factor contributing to the decline of 5th grade math, same cohort, was modest academic support for a first year teacher. Our SEL focus was primary in the support; we are moving towards a better balance of academics & SEL support.

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.

5th Grade math, the same grade level that had lowest performance and greatest decline, also had the greatest gap when compared to the state average; a gap of 1%. It is evident from the aforementioned questions that 5th grade math was a significant area of weakness overall. The trend we believe impacting this area has much to do with teacher expertise. Over the past three years there has been changes in 5th grade staffing; this year the team remains the same as last year.

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

6th Grade Math, same cohort, showed the most improvement. We believe this improvement was the result of creating smaller classrooms for our students who struggled in the area of mathematics. This movement allowed the teacher to appropriately challenge all of the students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The EWS data shows our greatest potential concern to be student daily attendance.

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

1. Support for SWD in the area of ELA.
2. Support for all teachers in the area of math with a focus on 5th Grade.
3. Support for all teachers in the area of reading.
4. Support for Hispanic students in the area of reading.
5. Improve daily attendance for all students with an emphasis on students who demonstrate Early Warning Signs (EWS).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title

School Wide Math Proficiency

Rationale

Based on our needs assessment data, our 5th grade math scores showed the lowest performance, greatest decline and largest gap when compared to state data. The data school-wide also showed declines in math in every grade level except 6th.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Suncoast Academy expects a 3% increase in all student proficiency in Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Steve Crump (steve.crump@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy

Based on student data the 5th grade model of delivery is changed allowing for a teacher with math specialization to meet with all 5th grade students.
 Revisit of drill and practice of math facts.
 As necessary pull small groups and create 1:1 opportunities for struggling students including SWD.
 Use of iReady or iXL math to target areas of weakness allowing differentiation.
 The specialized teacher has previous data demonstrating positive student growth in the area of math students in grades 4 & 5. Student data was used to inform this decision.
 Drill and practice allows students to "own" math facts and increases math literacy. Small Group & 1:1 work allows teachers to differentiate based on student skill deficiency.
 Teachers can assign specific skills via iReady & iXL to remediate or extend student competency as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Action Step

Description

1. Modify 5th grade schedule
2. Identify lowest performing math students via FSA & iReady data.
3. Use iReady & iXL to provide supports to struggling math students.
4. As needed, small groups or 1:1 with struggling students.
5. Administration meets with teachers quarterly to determine progress.

Person Responsible

Steve Crump (steve.crump@sarasotacountyschools.net)

| #2 | |
|---|--|
| Title | SWD ELA Proficiency |
| Rationale | 38% of Students with Disabilities are demonstrating proficiency in the area of ELA as determined by the FSA. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Sarasota Suncoast Academy expects a 3% increase in the number of Students with Disabilities who are proficient in ELA as determined by the FSA. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Joshua Leinweber (joshua.leinweber@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | <p>A focused use of reading remediation strategies including Readers Theater across content areas and iReady.</p> <p>In addition to these strategies, teachers are focusing on high interest novels, low vocabulary (hi-lo) novels with characters and conflicts that students can more easily relate with.</p> <p>At the middle grades, SWD, receive additional reading instruction via Intensive Language Arts (ILA) classes from teachers with ESE Certification.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | <p>Both Readers Theater and iReady will support an increase in student fluency & comprehension. The texts used in both approaches will be at and slightly above the students reading level encouraging the student to stretch their abilities.</p> <p>The incorporation of hi-lo novels in ILA classes is to reduce components of text that make decoding difficult. Hi-lo novels allow students to create relationships with texts and leads students to more challenging work.</p> <p>ILA classes are designed to have a lower student:teacher ratio, allowing for differentiation within the classroom based on student skills and interest levels.</p> |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide training for iReady & Readers Theater. 2. Grades 3-5 schedule computer / iReady access in labs 3 times a week; grades 6-8 iReady access twice a week. 3. At the middle school level schedule struggling SWD students into Intensive Language Arts courses with certified ESE instructor. 4. Provide appropriate texts for Readers Theater & hi-lo novels. 5. Monitor teacher implementation. 6. Use of iReady weekly to provide differentiation. 7. Meet monthly with staff to determine student growth. |
| Person Responsible | Joshua Leinweber (joshua.leinweber@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| #3 | |
|---|--|
| Title | Hispanic Subgroup ELA Proficiency |
| Rationale | There is a 15 point gap in proficiency between our Hispanic and White subgroups based on the FSA. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | There will be a 3% increase in the proficiency level of the Hispanic subgroup as evidenced on the FSA. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Joshua Leinweber (joshua.leinweber@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Increase parent communication and involvement through the use of bilingual staff and incorporate use of language development programs such as Duo-Lingo and Edmentum. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Parent involvement is key at Suncoast Academy and this year we have three staff members who are bilingual (more than previous years). Use of our bilingual staff to communicate with parents will yield students and families more engaged with the education process. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure staff is aware of which teachers are available to serve as translators. 2. Provide access to students to Duo-Lingo & Edmentum. 3. Work with staff so student use of the programs is part of their daily instruction. |
| Person Responsible | Joshua Leinweber (joshua.leinweber@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| #4 | |
|---|--|
| Title | School Wide ELA Proficiency |
| Rationale | Although Suncoast Academy out performed the district and state averages in ELA, overall our scores slipped from the 2017-2018 school year with an average of a 7 point decline when compared with the same cohort. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | All students will demonstrate a 3% growth in the area of reading. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Steve Crump (steve.crump@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | A focused use of reading strategies including Readers Theater across content areas and iReady. Use of high interest fiction and non-fiction in the classroom. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Readers Theater increases comprehension, develops fluency and engages students with the text. High interest novels maintains student engagement with text and assists with increasing vocabulary, problem solving and comprehension. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | 1. Grades 3-5 schedule computer / iReady access in labs 3 times a week; grades 6-8 iReady access twice a week. 2. Provide high interest novels. 3. Use of iReady weekly to provide differentiation. 4. Monitor teacher implementation. 5. Meet monthly with staff to determine student growth. |
| Person Responsible | Joshua Leinweber (joshua.leinweber@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| #5 | |
|---|--|
| Title | Average Daily Attendance |
| Rationale | 10% of students enrolled at Sarasota Suncoast Academy demonstrate an average daily attendance below 90%. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Suncoast Academy will reduce the percent of students with ADA below 90% by 2%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Joshua Leinweber (joshua.leinweber@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | <p>Attendance recognition celebrations.</p> <p>Monthly monitoring of student attendance accompanied by mailings to families.</p> <p>Individual parent meetings with families of children demonstrating chronic absences.</p> <p>Celebrations provide students with extrinsic motivation to attend school regularly.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | <p>Parents often are not conscious of how much school their child has missed; providing regular and timely notifications will increase awareness.</p> <p>When students are chronically absent meeting with parents to create and implement a plan for regular attendance creates a partnership focused on student success.</p> |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan quarterly attendance celebrations. 2. Run monthly report of students demonstrating a pattern of truancy: 3 absences in 30 days; 5 in 90 days 3. Run reports at specified number (40 days, 100 days) and identify students who have already missed 10% of school. 4. Provide parents with mailings and phone calls to notify them of their child's attendance pattern. 5. Create opportunities for meetings with parents as needed. |
| Person Responsible | Joshua Leinweber (joshua.leinweber@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| #6 | |
|---|--|
| Title | First Quartile ELA Gains |
| Rationale | Based on the student data, our lowest performing students in both the FRL & Hispanic subgroups demonstrated a 30% decline in growth on the 2018-2019 FSA. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The lowest performing students will demonstrate a 5% increase in learning gains. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Steve Crump (steve.crump@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | In grades 3-5, lowest performing students will receive focused instruction via iReady 3 times a week. In grades 6-8, lowest performing students will be scheduled into Intensive Language Arts classes for focused instruction including the incorporation of iReady, Readers Theater and high interest-low vocabulary texts. Teachers, in all content areas, will be made aware of their first quartile students. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | iReady allows for differentiation of material based on student skill deficits, providing the teacher flexibility to meet the needs of all students. ILA courses are designed to be smaller than content area classes allowing the teacher an opportunity to work in more small group and 1:1 scenarios. Knowing which students need the most help is important for all content teachers as the knowledge empowers the teachers to work individually with students, provide positive supports and modify lessons. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | 1. Schedule computer lab time to allow for iReady access in grades 3-5. 2. Schedule first quartile students into ILA courses. 3. Provide staff with which students comprise the first quartile. 4. Meet monthly with staff to review student progress and plan for student needs. |
| Person Responsible | Joshua Leinweber (joshua.leinweber@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

100% of elementary students' families perform 20 hours of volunteer time or more and 100% of middle school student families perform 10 hours of volunteer time or more. Family members have a variety of opportunities to be involved through the classroom, lunchroom, after school activities, as well as several celebrations throughout the year to include C.A.R.E.S., morning meetings, Fall Festival, Pajama Bingo, Spirit Nights, student achievements and a large variety of other activities that foster community. Parents are encouraged to become part of the PT4SO by attending meetings, assisting with the Sunshine Committee, being involved in school activities and assisting with fund raisers. As for the staff members, administration and teachers are actively involved with arrival and dismissal through opening car doors, escorting students, and maintaining a respectful and caring atmosphere. Every child is greeted by name throughout the day by administrators, teachers, and peers.

Parents are notified a minimum of eight times a year of their child's progress through quarterly progress reports and report cards, and at grades K-5 this also include a C.A.R.E.S. report based on the social skills that are being taught on a daily basis. Parents and students have constant access to online grades through Parent Portal. Students who are served through ESE services receive one or more reports each year to identify if goals are being met. Teachers hold conferences on an as needed basis with parents before and after school. The school's website displays important dates, the school's mission and vision, information about Responsive Classroom as well as links to individual teachers' class websites.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Community is built in the classroom during the first six weeks of school. Upper grade level students are mentors and "buddies" to lower grade level students. Employees and outside professionals work with students that have additional social-emotional needs. Students are able to meet with administration at any time when there are additional needs.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The board of directors determines the budget from the considerations given to them by the leadership team. All federal, state and local dollars are earmarked for the different programs below including the Digital Classroom Plan for Suncoast Academy. IReady, LEARN, teacher observations and formal assessments, IXL data, FSA data, Stanford 10 data, writing prompts, progress monitoring information, budget considerations, A+ money

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: School Wide Math Proficiency | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: SWD ELA Proficiency | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Hispanic Subgroup ELA Proficiency | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: School Wide ELA Proficiency | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Average Daily Attendance | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: First Quartile ELA Gains | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |