

Sarasota County Schools

Sarasota Military Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Sarasota Military Academy

801 N ORANGE AVE, Sarasota, FL 34236

www.sarasotamilitaryacademy.org

Demographics

Principal: Christina Bowman

Start Date for this Principal: 6/18/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	58%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Sarasota Military Academy

801 N ORANGE AVE, Sarasota, FL 34236

www.sarasotamilitaryacademy.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	No	46%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	49%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	C

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.

Combining extraordinary academics with the highest military principles of camaraderie, focus, leadership, integrity, compassion, poise, honor and respect, SMA's mission is to graduate young men and women who will confidently define their personal and unique goals for success in a multi-cultural and globalized world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sarasota Military Academy envisions a transformational academic program that addresses the needs of all learners and inspires ingenuity and motivation to reach their fullest potential. Through a military, character development model of excellence, SMA will produce leaders and innovators who are passionate about creating positive change for themselves, their community, and the world.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vara, Thomas	Principal	
Gillotte, Sylvia	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team Member; Curriculum and Instruction Committee Member; HS ELA Department Chair
Wasserman, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team Member; Culture and Environment Committee Member; HS Social Studies Department Chair
Clapp, Maria	School Counselor	School Leadership Team Member; Culture and Environment Committee Member; HS Counseling Department Chair
Morris, Becky	Assistant Principal	School Leadership Team Member; Data Collection and Analysis Committee Chair
Currie, Lisa	Assistant Principal	School Leadership Team Member; Curriculum and Instruction Committee Co-Chair
Brown-Santana, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team Member; Curriculum and Instruction Committee Member; PREP World Languages Department Chair
Pelletier, Carol	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team Member; Curriculum and Instruction Committee Member; PREP ELA Department Chair
Lee, Ryan	Assistant Principal	School Leadership Team Member; Culture and Environment Committee Co-Chair
Fout, Fred	Principal	School Leadership Team Co-Chair; HS (9-12) Campus Head of School
Rodriguez, Cathy	Assistant Principal	School Leadership Team Member; Curriculum and Instruction Committee Co-Chair
Williams, Abby	Assistant Principal	School Leadership Team Member; Culture and Environment Committee Co-Chair
Holland, Michael	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team Member; Curriculum and Instruction Committee Member; HS Mathematics Department Chair
Ferguson, Deanna	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team Member; Curriculum and Instruction Committee Member; PREP Science Department Chair
Fulghum, Mark	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team Member; Culture and Environment Committee Member; PREP Social Studies Department Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/18/2018, Christina Bowman

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

17

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

95

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	58%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	

SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	194	208	204	180	191	186	159	1322	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	18	22	25	30	26	140	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	13	13	12	8	7	64	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	8	2	10	33	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	33	16	13	4	68	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	19	19	30	32	27	157	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	11	24	12	13	0	0	80	

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	0	0	0	16	13	23	20	22	19	13	126

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	7	0	3	15	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	5	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/18/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	225	209	198	201	208	167	156	1364
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	25	23	32	34	36	57	221
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	4	1	1	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	23	18	30	39	23	20	166
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	37	23	40	59	32	0	218

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	0	0	0	8	18	8	36	29	29	23	151	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	225	209	198	201	208	167	156	1364
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	25	23	32	34	36	57	221
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	4	1	1	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	23	18	30	39	23	20	166
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	37	23	40	59	32	0	218

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	0	0	0	8	18	8	36	29	29	23	151	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	7	0	3	15	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	6	

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	58%	67%	56%	56%	63%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	53%	51%	53%	53%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	46%	42%	52%	43%	41%
Math Achievement	65%	63%	51%	42%	62%	49%
Math Learning Gains	56%	51%	48%	30%	46%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	48%	45%	29%	41%	39%
Science Achievement	58%	78%	68%	60%	68%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	81%	73%	75%	76%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	63%	63%	0%	54%	9%
	2018	64%	63%	1%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	67%	64%	3%	52%	15%
	2018	61%	62%	-1%	51%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	62%	66%	-4%	56%	6%
	2018	67%	70%	-3%	58%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
09	2019	50%	65%	-15%	55%	-5%
	2018	49%	66%	-17%	53%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
10	2019	47%	63%	-16%	53%	-6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	45%	65%	-20%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	61%	67%	-6%	55%	6%
	2018	64%	66%	-2%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	77%	73%	4%	54%	23%
	2018	69%	73%	-4%	54%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	61%	65%	-4%	46%	15%
	2018	73%	63%	10%	45%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	53%	62%	-9%	48%	5%
	2018	53%	62%	-9%	50%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	71%	77%	-6%	67%	4%
2018	56%	75%	-19%	65%	-9%
Compare		15%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	84%	85%	-1%	71%	13%
2018	81%	80%	1%	71%	10%
Compare		3%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	77%	-3%	70%	4%
2018	84%	76%	8%	68%	16%
Compare		-10%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	73%	-7%	61%	5%
2018	60%	77%	-17%	62%	-2%
Compare		6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	56%	69%	-13%	57%	-1%
2018	59%	71%	-12%	56%	3%
Compare		-3%			

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	20	38	35	30	39	36	18	46		95	10
ELL	25	41	41	36	43	46	21	47	20	91	30
ASN	59	40		88	73						
BLK	37	41		38	40	21	33	64		91	20
HSP	49	50	47	54	47	45	44	63	54	94	38
MUL	50	64		54	55		50				
WHT	64	54	49	74	63	48	69	90	72	96	46
FRL	49	51	48	57	50	42	47	72	52	91	32
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	22	44	47	36	45	40	33	50	17	100	14
ELL	20	42	44	26	43	50	25	62			
ASN	70	55									
BLK	40	37	9	48	44	43	42	73			
HSP	41	49	45	50	49	42	42	67	48	95	24
MUL	55	47		61	56						
WHT	67	57	45	74	63	56	69	82	56	97	37
FRL	48	49	42	56	51	43	49	69	46	94	20

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	18	35	34	19	32	29	29	63		86	17
ELL		45	61	28	34	28	35				
BLK	33	38		25	26	40	54			100	21
HSP	40	40	51	34	23	29	55	63		94	38
MUL	60	70		17							
WHT	64	60	52	48	34	29	64	80		94	32
FRL	41	45	52	37	32	36	50	68		94	31

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	723
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	65
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	66
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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.

A review of the overall 2019 state assessments in grades 6-8 and 9-12, revealed the lowest performing data component in high school mathematics learning gains for the lowest quartile at 28% and Math overall learning gains at 36%. Learning gains for the lowest quartile in Math and ELA also trended low for the middle school grades with 51% for each component. Contributing factors to low learning gains especially as it applies to the lowest quartile include focusing primarily on achievement goals rather than learner growth and effective differentiation strategies.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was also high school mathematics learning gains for the lowest quartile with a 13% drop from 41% in 2018 to 28% in 2019. At the middle school level, the greatest decline also occurred in Math learning gains for the lowest quartile, dropping 6% from 57% to 51%. The same contributing factors as noted for the lowest performance apply to the declining performance in the lowest quartile. It is also noted that at the 7th-grade level, increases were noted in both Math and ELA where teachers incorporated technology to enhance their formative assessments, learner feedback, and differentiated instructional strategies. Learning gains in intensive classes overall and for the lowest quartile indicated student progress as high as 67% for a highly effective teacher.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap compared to the state average was in College and Career Acceleration. Although SMA grew by 8% to 42% in College and Career Acceleration, this was still 25% below the Sarasota School District average of 67% and 19% below the state average of 61%. Factors that contributed to this gap include a lack of specific planning to support acceleration opportunities for all students at the high school level.

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

1) When looking at data components by grade level, ELA learning gains in grades 9-12 for the lowest quartile showed the most improvement, increasing 14% from 29% in 2018 to 43% in 2019. This significant increase was the result of last year's action step that included curricular alignment with Intensive Language Arts and the Florida state ELA standards, MTSS strategies, and progress monitoring through USATestPrep. 2) The next data component showing the most improvement was Middle School Acceleration, growing 13% from 53% in 2018 to 66% in 2019. Factors that contributed to this increase included specific planning for accelerated math progression beginning in 6th grade. Additionally, a math summer learning program using Khan Academy supported increased student mastery of skills in preparation for the next grade level. 3) Gains were also noted in the Hispanic subgroup for all components except math learning gains, social studies achievement, and graduation rate. Overall, this subgroup increased by 33 points. This increase was attributed to a specific plan addressing the growing Hispanic population at SMA that included specific supports for communication, cultural awareness, and access to resources that provide for scaffolding and a more equitable learning environment.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

A review of the EWS data reveals an area of concern for course failures in ELA or Math. The total increase from the prior year to the current year revealed increased failures at all levels except in 8th grade. The total increased by 29 students, growing from 137 in 2018 to 166 in 2019.

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

1. Learning gains at the lowest quartile and overall in Math and ELA
2. SWD subgroup in all components (falls below federal index)
3. College and Career Acceleration
4. Science achievement at the 8th-grade level

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Increase learning gains for all students

Area of Focus	A focus on student growth aligns with the need to improve in our school's weakest areas of learning gains both in Math and ELA. This will also support our struggling SWD learners who are underperforming resulting in an achievement gap falling below the Federal Index.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	By the year 2021, SMA's goal is to raise learning gains in the lowest quartile for math by a minimum of 4%, growing from 28% to 32% proficiency (levels 3, 4, & 5) on the FSA Mathematics Algebra 1 and Geometry EOCs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Fred Fout (fred.fout@oursma.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring using USA Test Prep and differentiated instruction through blended learning using Khan Academy. Progress monitoring reviewed within Mathematics and English departments bi-weekly. Individualized data tracking and instructional planning to differentiate by student using USA Test Prep and Khan Academy.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Co-teaching model will enhance RTI/MTSS within the Algebra classroom in order to provide additional small group instruction and instructional models for the lowest quartile as well as the remainder of the class. Data provided through consistent FSA aligned USA Test Prep progress monitoring and benchmark assessments will provide the instructional focus for classroom lesson design and small group instruction opportunities through the coteaching model. Additionally, Khan Academy will provide self-paced accessible instructional techniques in order to differentiate to individual learner's needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Research and determine co-teaching models to support the objective; one teach/one observe, one teach/one assist, parallel teaching, station teaching, alternative teaching, and team teaching.
2. Provide professional development to successfully implement and monitor the chosen co-teaching model(s) in the Algebra classroom.
3. Implement the co-teaching model with support from administration and department leadership in the Algebra classroom.
4. Schedule cyclic assessment and data collection opportunities using curricular progress monitoring tools and school computers.
5. Analyze and interpret data to target learning goals for the co-teacher teams.
6. Provide professional development and technical support for instructional staff to utilize Khan Academy to differentiate and enhance learning based on data in the Algebra and Geometry classrooms.
7. Monitor implementation with observation and feedback from administration and department leadership.

Person Responsible Michael Holland (michael.holland@oursma.org)

#2. Other specifically relating to Increase learning for Students with Disabilities in all components

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SWD learners currently show an achievement gap at 37% which is below the Federal Index.
Measurable Outcome:	By the year 2020, SMA's goal is to raise the subgroup for students with disabilities by 4%, bringing it above the Federal Index to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Thomas Vara (thomas.vara@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Implementation of Hattie's High Impact Teaching Strategies (HITS). Three strategies support assessment literacy of both teachers and students and have shown evidence of impacting student learning gains.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Setting Goals- Lessons have clear learning intentions with goals that clarify what success looks like. Lesson goals always explain what students need to understand, and what they must be able to do. 2. Feedback informs a student and/or teacher about the student's performance relative to learning goals. Feedback redirects teacher and student actions so the student can align effort and activity with a clear outcome that leads to achieving a learning goal. 3. Metacognitive strategies teach students to think about their own thinking. When students become aware of the learning process, they gain control over their learning. Metacognition extends to self-regulation, or managing one's own motivation toward learning. Metacognitive activities include planning how to approach learning tasks, evaluating progress, and monitoring comprehension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	HITS have emerged from the findings of tens of thousands of studies on what has worked in classrooms across Australia and the world. International experts often rank HITS at the top of strategies that contribute to student learning.
Action Steps to Implement	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce HITS to faculty 2. Create smart goals based on specific strategy 2. Monitor through general observation & evaluation process 3. Strategy is working if "teachers demonstrate" (specific to strategy) 4. Strategy is working if "students demonstrate" (specific to strategy) 	
Person Responsible	Lisa Currie (lisa.currie@oursma.org)

#3. Other specifically relating to Increase achievement for Algebra and Geometry**Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

High school math achievement results for Algebra 1 and Geometry EOCs dropped from 53% to 51% along with significant drops in learning gains.

Measurable Outcome:

By the year 2021, SMA's goal is to raise Algebra and Geometry achievement at the high school level by a minimum of 4%, growing from 51% to 55% proficiency (levels 3, 4, & 5) on the FSA Mathematics Algebra 1 and Geometry EOCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Holland (michael.holland@oursma.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Progress monitoring using curricular progress monitoring tools and differentiated instruction through blended learning using Khan Academy. Implementation of coteaching model on alternating days to provide tiered instructional support in the Algebra classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Co-teaching model will enhance RTI/MTSS within the Algebra classroom in order to provide additional small group instruction and instructional models for the lowest quartile as well as the remainder of the class. Data provided through consistent FSA aligned curricular progress monitoring and benchmark assessments will provide the instructional focus for Algebra and Geometry classroom lesson design and small group instruction opportunities through the co-teaching model. Additionally, Khan Academy will provide self paced accessible instructional techniques in order to differentiate to individual learner's needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Research and determine co-teaching models to support the objective; one teach/one observe, one teach/one assist, parallel teaching, station teaching, alternative teaching, and team teaching.
2. Provide professional development to successfully implement and monitor the chosen co-teaching model(s).
3. Implement the co-teaching model with support from administration and department leadership.
4. Schedule cyclic assessment and data collection opportunities using curricular progress monitoring tools and assessments, and school computers.
5. Analyze and interpret data to target learning goals for the co-teacher teams.
6. Provide professional development and technical support for instructional staff to utilize Khan Academy to differentiate and enhance learning based on data.
7. Monitor implementation with observation and feedback from administration and department leadership.

Person Responsible

Fred Fout (fred.fout@oursma.org)

#4. Other specifically relating to Improve chronic absenteeism among 12th grade students.**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The average attendance for 12th grade students during the 18-19 school year was 92.17% which increased to 93.25% for the 19-20 school year. The highest rate of chronic absenteeism among 12th grade students reached an all year high of 41 students missing 10% or more school days at the 170 day mark in 2019 and decreased to 26 students missing 10% or more school days at the 170 day mark in 2020. If you are missing 3 school days by day 30, you are considered chronically absent. SMA High School will continue to decrease the rate of chronic absenteeism in the 12th grade, with the goal of a 95.00% average attendance and less than 18 seniors chronically absent.

Measurable Outcome: 12th grade students will improve attendance meeting at least a 95% ADA rate overall, and reduce chronic absenteeism to less than 15% of the class.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Abby Williams (abby.williams@oursma.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Refer students in danger of attaining an attendance rate less than 90% to the SWST. SWST will institute an attendance contract with the student and parents. Attendance for individuals referred to SWST will be monitored weekly. Parent contacts will be made bi-weekly to ensure attendance is maintained. Students not meeting the threshold will be referred to Department of Motor Vehicles.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Contractual obligation reinforcement through the Attendance Contract.
2. Parent involvement through the Attendance Contract and consistent parent contacts.
3. Consistent monitoring through an existing student intervention model (SWST).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Student is identified at risk of exceeding absences
2. Student is referred to SWST for intervention
3. Student is placed on Attendance Contract through a Student/Parent/ Administrative meeting
4. Student is referred to Department of Motor Vehicles for non-compliance with State statute
5. SWST assigned interventionist and attendance clerk will make regular contact with parents regarding progress and individual absences

Person

Responsible Fred Fout (fred.fout@oursma.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

No additional areas of focus.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Based on Volunteers Count reports and parent sign-in sheets at a variety of activities for 2018-2019, the level of parent involvement is approximately 81%. Teachers use the Family Portal to communicate with parents about grades and classroom assignments. Additionally, students are connected to teachers through G Suite for education and the Clever portal. Educators are expected to contact parents often, especially for struggling or at-risk students. High school students and family members meet with school counselors to discuss graduation requirements and receive help with course planning.

Orientations and open house evenings are held once a year for cadets and families. Families of students in the IB/DP program meet regularly, with planned meetings at least quarterly. Students, faculty, and staff participate in Veterans Day and Memorial Day Parades. Parents and family members are also encouraged to participate. Cadets and families are involved in many extracurricular activities; athletics, and clubs. They are also involved in many community events and volunteer their time and represent the Academy. Parents/guardians help serve lunch on a daily basis and volunteer for a variety of needs on both the high school and middle school campuses.

The Parent, Teacher, Cadet Council (PTCC) for both campuses meets monthly and provides activities throughout the year for parent participation and communicates the Academy's progress and needs. Parents receive weekly email newsletter communications regarding upcoming events and activities. Social media also shares important activities, accomplishments, and community engagements.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Increase learning gains for all students				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0074 - Sarasota Military Academy	Title II		\$2,000.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Increase learning for Students with Disabilities in all components				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

			0074 - Sarasota Military Academy	Title IV		\$3,000.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Increase achievement for Algebra and Geometry				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Improve chronic absenteeism among 12th grade students.				\$0.00
Total:						\$5,000.00