

Sarasota County Schools

Sarasota Suncoast Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Sarasota Suncoast Academy

8084 HAWKINS RD, Sarasota, FL 34241

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/suncoast

Demographics

Principal: Stacy Homan

Start Date for this Principal: 4/15/2004

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	30%
2019-20 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%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Sarasota Suncoast Academy

8084 HAWKINS RD, Sarasota, FL 34241

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/suncoast

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)
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	23%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Crump, Steve	Principal	Oversee school
Homan, Stacy	Assistant Principal	Elementary students
Kamlade, Justin	Assistant Principal	middle grade students

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 4/15/2004, Stacy Homan

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	30%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	86	87	84	87	93	92	93	84	85	0	0	0	0	791	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	3	2	3	2	3	7	9	0	0	0	0	32	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	8	12	0	0	0	0	29	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	12	7	0	0	0	0	28	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/13/2020

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	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	

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	86	87	84	87	93	92	93	84	85	0	0	0	0	791
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	2	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	
	(0)	(0)	(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
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%
	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%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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					
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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
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%	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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	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	65
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.

The data with the lowest performance was the lowest 25% in ELA. Factors include a change in the way we ran ELA classes and having on level kids in the lowest 25%.

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

The data with the lowest percentile was the lowest 25% in ELA. Factors include a change in the way we ran ELA classes and having on level kids in the lowest 25%.

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.

Math and ELA lowest 25% were below the state average. The reason for this factor is that our students test considerably higher than the state average which raises our 25% in the on level range. Some students in our lowest 25% are considered on level students.

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

ELA in the 5th grade showed the greatest improvement from the previous year. We continue to train teachers in professional development areas.

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

Number of students scoring level 1 in 7th grade math and 8th grade ELA.

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

1. 5th Grade Mathematics
2. Gains in the Lowest 25%
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When looking at the needs assessment, SSA learning gains for the lowest 25% was at 47% which was below the state and district marks.
---	--

Measurable Outcome:	On the 20-21 FSA scores for the lowest 25% in ELA, the percentage of students making gains will increase by a minimum of 2% from 47 to 49.
----------------------------	--

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Steve Crump (steve.crump@sarasotacountyschools.net)
---	---

Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with IEP's or that scored to be placed in ILA will be given small group instruction to increase the skills necessary to be on-level or proficient in ELA standards using IXL, I-Ready, and other curricular programs.
---------------------------------	--

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for this strategy is having a skilled educator deliver content in a smaller setting, giving students additional ELA time, and proven ELA resources to enhance the learning that is occurring in the classroom.
---	--

Action Steps to Implement

Use of iReady or iXL reading to target areas of weakness allowing differentiation, As necessary pull small groups and create 1:1 opportunities for struggling students including SWD with the newly hired ILA teacher, A focused use of reading remediation strategies including Readers Theater across content areas and iReady.

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. At the middle grades, SWD, receive additional reading instruction via Intensive Language Arts (ILA) classes from teachers with ESE Certification. Increase parent communication and involvement through the use of bilingual staff and incorporate use of language development programs such as Duo-Lingo and Edmentum.

Person Responsible	Steve Crump (steve.crump@sarasotacountyschools.net)
---------------------------	---

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

Suncoast Academy is developing a leadership team that will enhance the ability for administration to get into more classrooms and provide better academic and social-emotional coverage for teachers and students. The model of one administrator over 800 students from kindergarten through 8th grade didn't allow for the expertise needed to service all the needs of the school. A drop in scores and a look at the climate survey were determining factors.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the 2020-21 school year, Suncoast will have 2 assistant principals, one at the middle and one at the elementary, develop skillsets to help be leaders in the educational curriculum, exceptional student education, remote learning, and community building across the Suncoast campus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Steve Crump (steve.crump@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Leadership team being developed with daily to weekly meetings to discuss challenges/issues.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The expertise of the principal with 17 years of experience to sit down with the developing assistants that have no experience in the educational leadership roles that they are taking on.

Action Steps to Implement

Principal sitting down with Assistants daily to weekly as needed.
Introduction to leadership topics and challenges.
Action plan steps to deal with challenges.
Shared successes across the school and understanding of differences at both locations.
On the job training.

Person Responsible

Steve Crump (steve.crump@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of****Focus** 5th grade Math Proficiency.**Description and** 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.**Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:**

Suncoast Academy expects a 3% increase in 5th grade proficiency in math

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacy Homan (stacy.homan@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 for struggling students including SWD. use of iReady and IXL to target areas of weakness allowing differentiation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The specialized teacher has previous data demonstrating positive student growth in the area of math students in grades 4 and 5. Student data was used to inform this decision. Drill and practice allows students to "own" math facts and increases math literacy. Small group work allows teacher to differentiate based on student skill deficiency. Teachers can assign specific skills via iReady and iXL to remediate or extend student competency as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

Modify 5th grade schedule.

Identify lowest performing math students via iReady data and FSA.

Use iReady and iXL to provide supports to struggling math students.

Quarterly meeting with administration to determine progress.

Person**Responsible** Stacy Homan (stacy.homan@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Hispanic Subgroup ELA Proficiency There is a 15 % gap in proficiency between level of the Hispanic subgroup on the FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	There will be a 3% increase in the proficiency level of the Hispanic subgroup as evidenced on the FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Justin Kamlade (justin.kamlade@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase parent communication 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 SSA and this year we have four staff members that are bilingual (more than previous years). Use of our bilingual staff to communicate with parents will yield students and families more engaged in the educational process.

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure all staff are aware teachers that are able to translate when needed.
 Provide access to Duo-Lingo and Edmentum for students.
 Work with staff so student use of the programs are part of their daily instruction.

Person Responsible Justin Kamlade (justin.kamlade@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Leadership will plan staff development opportunities for students to work with the lowest 25% in ELA and Math. The school has hired a middle school ILA teacher that will serve several with learning disabilities that are contained inside of the lowest 25% in ELA. We will review the data with each team at grade levels or content to walk through deficits in resources and/or curriculum.

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.

Suncoast Academy is built on the Responsive Classroom Approach to teaching. The social-emotional component for the students that attend is as important as the academic content being tested. Suncoast teaches that the classroom and the school are a community where students learn to care for one another. The character traits that are being taught daily include Cooperation, Assertion, Responsibility, Empathy, and Self-Control. The first 20 minutes of every day are spend in a morning meeting at the elementary level and in advisory at the middle grades level. The components are a greeting, an activity, a time to share, and a time for news and announcements. Suncoast also trains all teachers in the Responsive Classroom approach before they ever start their teaching career at the school. They train for 4 days, 7 hours each day, the summer before they start and the summer after their first year.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00