

Sarasota County Schools

Suncoast Polytechnical High School



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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Suncoast Polytechnical High School

4650 BENEVA RD, Sarasota, FL 34233

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/suncoastpolytechnical

Demographics

Principal: Jack Turgeon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	39%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (79%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (70%)
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

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota County School Board.

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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Suncoast Polytechnical High School

4650 BENEVA RD, Sarasota, FL 34233

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/suncoastpolytechnical

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 9-12	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	No	35%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota County School Board.

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 Suncoast Polytechnical High School is to provide a high quality personalized educational experience where students master a rigorous career and technology driven curriculum within a thematic, analytical and interactive teaching and learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is the vision of Suncoast Polytechnical High School to be recognized for providing a world class technical education.

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
Turgeon, Jack	Principal	
Disz, Tim	Teacher, K-12	
Finger, Russell	Teacher, K-12	
LaPorte, Staci	Teacher, K-12	
Ferris, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	
Henderson, Nina	Teacher, K-12	
McNellis, Julianne	Teacher, K-12	
Nielubowicz, Caroline	School Counselor	
Raney, Michael	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Jack Turgeon

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

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	39%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (79%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (70%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164	147	132	113	556
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	5	11	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	3	5	20
Course failure in ELA	0	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	1	1	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	9

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	1	0	1

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	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/8/2020

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	0	0	0	170	140	135	135	580	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	9	13	24	65	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	6	12	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	10	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	7	15	

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	10	2	2	21	35

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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170	140	135	135	580
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	9	13	24	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	6	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	7	15

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	10	2	2	21	35

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	0	0	0	

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	89%	67%	56%	85%	63%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	53%	51%	63%	53%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	46%	42%	66%	43%	41%
Math Achievement	85%	63%	51%	70%	62%	49%
Math Learning Gains	51%	51%	48%	45%	46%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	48%	45%	52%	41%	39%
Science Achievement	97%	78%	68%	95%	68%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	81%	73%	92%	76%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	87%	65%	22%	55%	32%
	2018	92%	66%	26%	53%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	91%	63%	28%	53%	38%
	2018	80%	65%	15%	53%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

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

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	77%	20%	67%	30%
2018	95%	75%	20%	65%	30%
Compare		2%			
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	94%	77%	17%	70%	24%
2018	94%	76%	18%	68%	26%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	73%	10%	61%	22%
2018	91%	77%	14%	62%	29%
Compare		-8%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	88%	69%	19%	57%	31%
2018	86%	71%	15%	56%	30%
Compare		2%			

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	83	50								100	75
HSP	87	64	74	87	53		97	92		100	65
MUL	82	45		100	73						
WHT	91	63	80	86	50	61	98	93		99	78
FRL	83	58	63	80	53	63	95	92		98	68
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	85	46									
ASN	80										
HSP	82	59	56	88	53	67	93	88		100	70
WHT	88	61	61	89	60	76	96	96		90	84
FRL	79	59	53	83	54	61	90	92		92	81
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	80	75		67	48			92			
BLK				50	50						
HSP	78	57	55	64	38	39	93	86		94	75
WHT	87	65	69	73	46	55	95	93		98	73
FRL	80	55	56	64	44	51	89	88		98	70

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	79
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	787
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	77
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	80
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	75
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	80
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	75
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.

SPHS Math Learning gains showed the lowest performance (51%). Contributing factors include the proliferation of students taking Algebra I in 8th grade resulting in the majority of students taking Algebra I in high school not having a background and pattern of math success. The number of students entering SPHS as Freshmen who have already taken Algebra I has increased significantly for the 2020-2021 school year.

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

SPHS Math Learning Gains declined by 8% from 59% in 2018 to 51% in 2019. Contributing factors include the proliferation of students taking Algebra I in 8th grade resulting in the majority of students taking Algebra I in high school not having a background and pattern of math success. The number of students entering SPHS as Freshmen who have already taken Algebra I has increased significantly for the 2020-2021 school year.

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.

All SPHS data points exceeded state averages however, Math Learning Gains were the closest to the state average (SPHS - 51%, State 48%). Contributing factors include the proliferation of students taking Algebra I in 8th grade resulting in the majority of students taking Algebra I in high school not having a background and pattern of math success. The number of students entering SPHS as Freshmen who have already taken Algebra I has increased significantly for the 2020-2021 school year.

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

SPHS ELA L25 Learning Gains increased from 57% in 2018 to 71% in 2019. SPHS further implemented PD focused on Visible Learning, Learning Intentions/Success Criteria and Teacher Clarity. SPHS continues to focus on these instructional practices for the 2020-21 school year.

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

Although there is always room for improvement, ESSA data is in line with expectations.

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

1. Align scheduling of CTE Pathways and AP courses to maximize student growth and opportunity for acceleration.
2. Continued implementation of Visible Learning, Learning Intentions/Success Criteria and Teacher Clarity
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Acceleration

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The AP Capstone Diploma Program offers an opportunity for acceleration for students. This program demonstrates students' ability and willingness to tackle rigorous coursework over the course of their high school career. The AP Capstone Diploma requires students to complete 4 AP courses of their choosing along with AP Seminar and AP Research and receive a passing grade of 3 or higher on the corresponding AP exams.

Measurable Outcome: 1. SPHS will increase the number of graduates in the 2020-2021 school year who receive the AP Capstone Diploma.
2. There will be an increase in the number of students choosing the AP Capstone Diploma Program.
3. The overall AP exam pass rate will increase.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jack Turgeon (jack.turgeon@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students who earn scores of 3 or higher in AP Seminar and AP Research and on four additional AP Exams of their choosing receive the AP Capstone Diploma. SPHS Guidance Department will continue to provide information about the AP Capstone Diploma Program and promote the AP Capstone Diploma Program Night for parents and students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Participating in AP Capstone can help students:
Stand out to colleges in the application process.
Develop key academic skills they'll use in college and beyond.
Become self-confident, independent thinkers and problem solvers.
Earn college credit: Many colleges offer credit for qualifying scores.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SPHS Math Learning Gains decreased from 59% in 2018 to 51% in 2019. This data reflects overall math improvement in students and is included in School Grade calculations.

Measurable Outcome: SPHS Math Learning Gains will be 60% or above for 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michael Raney (michael.raney@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Improve utilization of USA Test Prep as a formative assessment tool through PD to analyze specific areas for remediation. Teachers will utilize Visible Learning instructional strategies including Learning Intentions, Success Criteria and Teacher Clarity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers are receiving additional professional development and training to better utilize USA Test Prep data to drive instruction. Teachers will utilize Visible Learning instructional Strategies including Learning Intentions, Success Criteria and Teacher Clarity which have been shown to have a significant impact on learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will continue to receive additional PD to support from Curriculum Specialist for the implementation of USA Test Prep as a formative assessment.
2. Teachers will conduct and monitor Benchmark Assessments and use USA Test Prep data to drive instruction.
3. Teachers will attend school based professional development for high expectation teaching strategies and implement the strategies for all students.
4. Math Lab will be available for all students to provide remediation/intervention after school Monday - Thursday 2:15 - 3:30.
5. Students in need of remediation/intervention will have their seminar aligned with math teachers to provide direct instruction.
6. Math teachers, Guidance Counselors and admin will review students who struggle on beginning of the year benchmark tests for Algebra I to determine if any students need to retake Algebra I rather than moving on to Geometry.

Person Responsible: Michael Raney (michael.raney@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: ELA Learning Gains made only a slight improvement from 60% in 2019 to 62% in 2019.

Measurable Outcome: ELA Learning Gains will improve from 62% in 2019 to 66% in 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jack Turgeon (jack.turgeon@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Improve utilization of USA Test Prep as a formative assessment tool through PD to analyze specific areas for remediation. Teachers will utilize Visible Learning instructional Strategies including Learning Intentions, Success Criteria and Teacher Clarity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers need additional professional development and training to better utilize USA Test Prep data to drive instruction. Teachers will utilize Visible Learning instructional Strategies including Learning Intentions, Success Criteria and Teacher Clarity which have been shown to have a significant impact on learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers continue to receive PD from Curriculum Specialists to support the implementation of USA Test Prep as a formative assessment.
2. Teachers will conduct and monitor Benchmark Assessments and use USA Test Prep data to drive instruction.
3. Teachers will attend school based professional development for high expectation teaching strategies and implement the strategies for all students.
4. Students in need of remediation/intervention will have their seminar aligned with ELA teachers to provide direct instruction.

Person Responsible Jack Turgeon (jack.turgeon@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

There are no other areas.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Acceleration				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1391 - Suncoast Polytechnical High School	Title II		\$2,000.00
			Notes: AP Capstone Diploma Program			

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$2,000.00