

Sarasota County Schools

Sarasota High School



2021-22 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 | 20 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 29 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 30 |

Sarasota High School

2155 BAHIA VISTA ST, Sarasota, FL 34239

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/sarasotahigh

Demographics

Principal: Ryan Chase

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 47% |
| 2020-21 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: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (57%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |

* 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 | 20 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 30 |

Sarasota High School

2155 BAHIA VISTA ST, Sarasota, FL 34239

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/sarasotahigh

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School 9-12 | No | 40% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 42% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | A | A | B |

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.

Sarasota High School will be a premier educational institution, source of pride and innovation in our community, and the cornerstone of emerging economic opportunities - producing a 21st century workforce in an ever changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sarasota High School graduates every student prepared for higher learning and careers to empower them as knowledgeable and engaged citizens, innovators, and life-long learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Anderson, Michelle | Assistant Principal | |
| Aschenbrenner, Mark | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Barresi, Gina | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Budd, Barbara | Teacher, Career/Technical | |
| Davis, Christopher | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Gilliland, Mark | Assistant Principal | |
| Harshman, Andy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Jones, David | Principal | |
| Kaplan, Deb | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Karas, Stella | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Livingston, Robin | Assistant Principal | |
| Moyer, Becky | Assistant Principal | |
| Volz, Ed | ELL Compliance Specialist | |
| Stroughter, Keatrun | Assistant Principal | |
| Rupprecht, Mark | Teacher, ESE | |
| Perkins, Robert | Dropout Prevention Coordinator | |
| Markley, Debra | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Donovan, Sean | Assistant Principal | |
| Phillips, Gwen | Teacher, K-12 | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Ryan Chase

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.*

2

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

135

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,556

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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 | 699 | 755 | 576 | 504 | 2534 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 69 | 71 | 7 | 238 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 39 | 24 | 19 | 150 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 56 | 37 | 23 | 139 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 53 | 28 | 19 | 123 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 55 | 84 | 57 | 293 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 95 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 17 | 8 | 0 | 38 | |

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 | 16 | 69 | 56 | 4 | 145 |

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 | 17 | 23 | 14 | 0 | 54 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 7 | 1 | 25 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/9/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 731 | 595 | 546 | 458 | 2330 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 81 | 74 | 74 | 334 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 82 | 45 | 33 | 303 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 47 | 24 | 11 | 97 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 56 | 31 | 17 | 121 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 68 | 83 | 56 | 315 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 104 | |
| Students in Summer Boost (2020) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 56 | |

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 | 138 | 91 | 57 | 42 | 328 |

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 | 27 | 38 | 14 | 0 | 79 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 16 | 7 | 2 | 40 |

2020-21 - 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 | 0 | 731 | 595 | 546 | 458 | 2330 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 81 | 74 | 74 | 334 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 82 | 45 | 33 | 303 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 47 | 24 | 11 | 97 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 56 | 31 | 17 | 121 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 68 | 83 | 56 | 315 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| Students in Summer Boost (2020) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 56 |

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 | 138 | 91 | 57 | 42 | 328 |

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 | 27 | 38 | 14 | 0 | 79 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 16 | 7 | 2 | 40 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 63% | 67% | 56% | 63% | 67% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 53% | 53% | 51% | 52% | 57% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 41% | 46% | 42% | 39% | 47% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 55% | 63% | 51% | 62% | 69% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 48% | 51% | 48% | 45% | 52% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 42% | 48% | 45% | 39% | 53% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 74% | 78% | 68% | 75% | 77% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 80% | 81% | 73% | 77% | 79% | 71% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 65% | -3% | 55% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 63% | -4% | 53% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |

| 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 |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 70% | 77% | -7% | 67% | 3% |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 78% | 77% | 1% | 70% | 8% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 36% | 73% | -37% | 61% | -25% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 62% | 69% | -7% | 57% | 5% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

APM was used for ELA 9th and 10th grade. This was a pilot test for our district. It was the first time the assessment was administered in the district and at Sarasota High. District developed benchmark assessments were administered to Algebra 1, Biology, Geometry, and US History classes.

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 12 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 22 | 33 | 29 | 35 | 31 | 26 | 39 | 47 | | 76 | 42 |
| ELL | 28 | 40 | 34 | 26 | 35 | 30 | 45 | 32 | | 87 | 73 |
| ASN | 74 | 58 | | | | | | 82 | | 100 | 100 |
| BLK | 41 | 42 | 46 | 39 | 34 | 26 | 46 | 52 | | 89 | 54 |
| HSP | 45 | 40 | 27 | 33 | 29 | 30 | 64 | 52 | | 89 | 73 |

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| MUL | 56 | 52 | 42 | 60 | 45 | 60 | 83 | 70 | | 96 | 78 |
| WHT | 69 | 55 | 39 | 64 | 31 | 38 | 83 | 80 | | 93 | 90 |
| FRL | 47 | 42 | 33 | 40 | 32 | 32 | 61 | 61 | | 88 | 72 |
| 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 | 35 | 35 | 25 | 43 | 50 | 30 | 56 | | 68 | 46 |
| ELL | 21 | 53 | 52 | 32 | 40 | 37 | 42 | 44 | | 72 | 52 |
| ASN | 79 | 61 | | 62 | 36 | | 70 | 79 | | 100 | 100 |
| BLK | 38 | 37 | 29 | 25 | 33 | 23 | 48 | 64 | | 65 | 50 |
| HSP | 46 | 48 | 46 | 42 | 39 | 40 | 60 | 72 | | 85 | 64 |
| MUL | 67 | 58 | | 48 | 42 | | 77 | 76 | | 91 | 70 |
| WHT | 71 | 56 | 39 | 66 | 53 | 48 | 81 | 86 | | 86 | 85 |
| FRL | 47 | 46 | 38 | 43 | 40 | 35 | 63 | 70 | | 80 | 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 | 24 | 33 | 29 | 35 | 33 | 19 | 52 | 44 | | 76 | 28 |
| ELL | 13 | 45 | 44 | 34 | 48 | 35 | 53 | 29 | | 41 | 28 |
| ASN | 81 | 50 | | 92 | 45 | | 91 | 83 | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 48 | 29 | 40 | 38 | | 49 | 56 | | 73 | 41 |
| HSP | 46 | 43 | 32 | 47 | 39 | 37 | 67 | 70 | | 72 | 52 |
| MUL | 64 | 48 | | 65 | 57 | | 83 | 69 | | 86 | 89 |
| WHT | 72 | 56 | 45 | 69 | 48 | 42 | 81 | 83 | | 85 | 76 |
| FRL | 47 | 46 | 37 | 53 | 41 | 32 | 67 | 67 | | 76 | 56 |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 59 |
| 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 | 59 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 645 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 92% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 38 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 44 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 83 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 47 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 49 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 64 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| White Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - White Students | 64 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 52 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

One of the trends that emerged for the 2021 data is a decline in proficiency rates across most of the core content areas. The drop was not evident for the Biology data. Additionally, the stagnation in the proficiency levels of our bottom quartile students is evident in the longitudinal data both in ELA and Mathematics.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data components in need of improvement cover many of the reporting categories. Many of the components had lower scores in 2021 than they did in 2019. ELA bottom quartile learning gains demonstrated a loss of 6 percentage points, a drop to 35% proficiency from 41%. Mathematics data reports the same loss for bottom quartile students, with a drop to 35% from 42% in 2019. Social Studies data also demonstrated a 11% point drop in proficiency levels, based on 2021 performance.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

A major contributing factor to the 2021 performance data is the impact of the pandemic. The process of quarantine and the rate of students attending school remotely affected the ability of staff to deliver instruction utilizing evidence-based methods implemented in years prior.

A significant focus for the 2022 school year, is the implementation of during school and after school intervention services. Core content areas are directed to use PLC opportunities to review data and develop remediation plans for students. School attendance is closely monitored to identify students that are in need of intervention and support.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The Biology EOC data demonstrated the most improvement. The overall proficiency rate increase from 74% to 76%. This is the only core content component that showed positive growth. Accelerated coursework and the graduation rate also had an increase in attainment.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The science department focuses on using a collaborative PLC approach to support science instruction across grade levels. PLC work is structured around analysis of standard alignment in courses offered to ninth and tenth grade students. A common planning period is successfully used to develop common assessments and review data. Our accelerated coursework success is attributable to an intentional plan to offer rigorous coursework and/or CTE courses to every student.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Increased effectiveness of PLC work among core content areas.
Implementation of core content tutoring at least two days a week after school.
Benchmark data analysis to develop student and standard specific remediation plans.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers at Sarasota High School will be participating in professional development to analyze student performance data based upon benchmark testing results. The goal of the professional development is to identify standards and students that require remediation. Data analysis of 2021 summative assessments provide direction to improve instruction in reporting categories that were low-performing. Benchmark data analysis provides information regarding the needs for immediate remediation for students. Core content PLCs will convene after each benchmark administration to develop and implement a remediation plan for students. Professional development for teachers also includes reinforcing and strengthening the PLC process on campus by focusing on the role of the teacher as a professional learner and collaborator alongside their peers.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Each core content area, ELA, Mathematics, Biology, and US History have content certified teachers conducting tutoring sessions at least two days a week. PLC teams will implement data analysis tools to delve into benchmark results to create remediation plans to support mastery learning of standards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Literacy skills are fundamental to all content areas and the overall academic success of students. Literacy skills are a core component of establishing Sarasota High as a preeminent educational institution. ELA Proficiency and Learning Gains comprise 30% of the overall school grade calculation for high schools. |
| Measurable Outcome: | By the year 2021-22, at least 66% of Sarasota High School students will demonstrate proficiency on the 9th and 10th grade FSA ELA Writing and Reading Assessment. 56% of students will demonstrate a learning gain, and 44% of our Lowest Quartile students will demonstrate a learning gain. |
| Monitoring: | Monitoring of the progress toward the goal consists of administrative walk-throughs and participation in data analysis meetings after each benchmark assessment administered by APM. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Keatrun Stroughter (keatrun.stroughter@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | The following assessment tools will be utilized by ELA/ILA teachers and administrators in PLC meetings, department meetings, and in individualized coaching sessions: Writing benchmarks, FSA practice test results, Achieve 3000 data, teachers' informal data, & USA Test Prep. Department administrator and APC will conduct classroom observations to provide individualized coaching feedback. Additional strategies/resources will be utilized, but not limited to: Common Planning for English 1 and English 2, USA Test Prep (Common Assessments), Instructional Focus Guide (IFG), CPALMS, UpFront Scholastic magazine, College Board / Khan Academy, Vocabulary.com, and after-school tutoring. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | SHS teachers will collaborate with the Sarasota County District ELA Curriculum Specialist to provide specific and targeted PD in the areas of ELA and Intensive Language Arts. A focus on best practices and instructional strategies to support learners. Through collaboration, teachers will engage in developing and implementing effective instructional strategies and plans for remediation. Teachers will use data to develop remediation plans to address the learning needs of students. |

Action Steps to Implement

Participate in regular collaborative classroom visits with district support staff to calibrate with district expectations within the classroom.

Person Responsible Keatrun Stroughter (keatrun.stroughter@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Using a tiered approach, engage and support at-risk learners (bottom quartile) through use of school based staff (teachers, counselors, liaisons, ESE aides, ELL aides, administrators, at-risk coordinator) to conduct student and parent conferences, provide resources, and academic supports for students that are struggling with content.

Person Responsible Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Provide individualized coaching from administration based on teachers' identified areas of improvement and observation data.

Person Responsible Keatrun Stroughter (keatrun.stroughter@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Participate in weekly PLC meetings with like-content teachers to analyze student work, reflect on progress monitoring data, and make instructional decisions as a professional team.

Person Responsible Keatrun Stroughter (keatrun.stroughter@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In the 2020-21 school year, US History EOC scores decreased by 11% after an 3% increase from the year prior. We plan to meet with instructional staff and review US History assessment data and reporting category data to determine areas of instructional improvement and content weakness for all students

Measurable Outcome: By the year 2021- 22, 82% of students taking the US History End-of-Course Exam will demonstrate proficiency.

Monitoring: Monitoring of the progress toward the goal consists of administrative walk-throughs and participation in data analysis meetings after each benchmark assessment administered by the district.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will also participate in district-led PD session, based developing remediation plans based on student data from teacher created common formative assessments and benchmark results. This is based on best practices and allows time to collaborate, design, and refine highly-effective lessons focused on mastery of standards and tiered interventions for students. The following assessment tools will be utilized by social studies teachers and administrators in PLC meetings, department meetings, and in individualized coaching sessions: Benchmark assessments, USA Test Prep, Progress monitoring data using IFG implementation, and PLC notes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: SHS social studies teachers will collaborate with the Sarasota County District Curriculum Specialist to provide specific and targeted PD in the areas of data analysis and development of interventions and remediation plans. A focus on best practices and instructional strategies to support learners in the mastery of course standards. Through collaboration, teachers will engage in developing and implementing effective instructional strategies and plans for remediation. Teachers will use data to develop remediation plans to address the learning needs of students.

Action Steps to Implement

Participate in regular collaborative classroom visits with district support staff to calibrate with district expectations within the classroom.

Person Responsible Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Using a tiered approach, engage and support at-risk learners through use of school based staff (counselors, liaisons, ESE aides, ELL aides, administrators, at-risk coordinator) to conduct student and parent conferences, provide resources, and academic supports for students that are struggling with content.

Person Responsible Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Participate in weekly PLC meetings with like-content teachers to analyze student work, reflect on progress monitoring data, and make instructional decisions as a professional team.

Person Responsible Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Provide individualized coaching from administration based on teachers' identified areas of improvement and observation data.

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Person Responsible | Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
|---------------------------|---|

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>Mathematics proficiency showed a decreased from the 2018-19 to the 2020-21 school year. Specialized attention must be placed to address the specific needs of the students who now enter high school to take Algebra 1.</p> <p>This population has changed in recent years due to the increase in students taking Algebra 1 in middle school creating a new focus on targeted student and teacher interventions to increase achievement in this area. Additionally, FSA EOC Math scores account for 30% of our school grade and must be fully supported to achieve our goals. Students this year are able to meet the ALG1 graduation requirement through concordant scores on the PSAT and by demonstrating proficiency on the Geometry EOC.</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: | By the year 2021-22, 55% of all students in Algebra 1, and 65% in Geometry will demonstrate proficiency on their respective End-of-Course Exams and a minimum of 53% will demonstrate a learning gain. Additionally, at least 47% of our Lowest Quartile students will demonstrate a learning gain. |
| Monitoring: | Monitoring of the progress toward the goal consists of administrative walk-throughs and participation in data analysis meetings after each benchmark assessment administered by the district. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Sean Donovan (sean.donovan@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>The following assessment tools will be utilized by Mathematics teachers and administrators in PLC meetings, department meetings, and in individualized coaching sessions:</p> <p>District benchmarks, FSA practice test results, teachers' informal data, & USA Test Prep.</p> <p>1:1 Teacher Coaching from Math TOSA Common Planning for Algebra and Geometry Curriculum/DOK Support from District Math Specialist School Wide Common Assessments Focus on PSAT, SAT, and ACT for those needing concordant IXL Kuta software Algebra Nation College Board / Khan Academy</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Sarasota High School will work in combination with Sarasota High School's part-time Mathematics Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) and Sarasota County Schools' Mathematics Curriculum Specialist to provide targeted PD in Mathematics, focused on cooperative learning structures, standards-based instruction, student engagement, and small-group intervention. These trainings will allow time for teachers to collaborate, design, and refine highly effective lessons which meet the needs of the students in their classroom.</p> <p>The strategy selected provides the opportunity for teachers to collaborate with colleagues from Sarasota High and from other district high schools in refining best practices. Through this professional development opportunity and PLC work, teachers will be able to use research-based strategies to help drive instruction and utilize data to make informed curricular decisions.</p> |

Action Steps to Implement

Participate in regular collaborative classroom visits with district support staff to calibrate with district expectations within the classroom

Person Responsible Sean Donovan (sean.donovan@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Participate in weekly PLC meetings with like-content teachers to analyze student work, decipher data, and make instructional decisions as a professional team.

Person Responsible Sean Donovan (sean.donovan@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Meet monthly in department meetings to review school, district, and state expectations and provide time for team to collaborate and problem-solve.

Person Responsible Sean Donovan (sean.donovan@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Collaborate with At-Risk Coordinator to provide data-driven interventions to students through a variety of strategies and intervention groups to provide individualized support throughout all at-risk subgroups.

Person Responsible Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Learning Gains for our Lowest Quartile ELA and Math Students (by sub-groups) Students in the Lowest Quartile are among our most at-risk students for failing to meet graduation requirements, thus limiting their post-secondary potential. It is of vital importance that students in the Lowest Quartile receive specialized interventions focused on data that reveal how to individually target their skill deficiencies in order to make learning gains.

By the year 2021-22, 44% of Lowest Quartile students will make a learning gain on the FSA Reading Assessment, including increases in the following subgroups:
 African-American Students increase from 25% to 45%
 English Language Learners increase from 50% to 60%
 Students with Disabilities increase from 35% to 45%

Measurable Outcome:

By the year 2021-22, 47% of Lowest Quartile students will make a learning gain on the Algebra 1 or Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Exam, including increases in the following subgroups:
 African-American Students increase from 20% to 45%
 English Language Learners increase from 37% to 50%
 Students with Disabilities increase from 50% to 55%

Monitoring:

Each of the department administrators will work with the APC to review data and progress toward goals. The at-risk coordinator will monitor academic progress of students. As need arises, interventions will be identified and implemented to support student learning and growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The strategy selected provides the opportunity for teachers to collaborate with colleagues from Sarasota High and from other district high schools in refining best practices. Through this professional development opportunity, and PLC work, teachers will be able to use research-based strategies to help drive instruction and utilize data to make informed curricular decisions.
 The following assessment tools will be utilized by ELA/ILA and Mathematics teachers and administrators in PLC meetings, department meetings, and in individualized coaching sessions:
 APM and District benchmarks,
 FSA test results,
 teachers' informal data, &
 USA Test Prep.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Sarasota High School will work in combination with Sarasota High School's part-time Mathematics Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) and Sarasota County Schools' ELA and Mathematics Curriculum Specialists to provide targeted PD in ELA and Mathematics, focused on cooperative learning structures, standards-based instruction, student engagement, and small group intervention. These trainings will allow time for teachers to collaborate, design, and refine highly effective lessons which meet the needs of the students in their classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

Using the data dashboards created by the school district Research, Assessment, and Evaluation (RAE) Office, identify students in the Lowest Quartile.

Person Responsible Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Analysis of assessment data to identify skill or content deficiencies in order to develop an academic plan to meet the needs of the learner.

Person Responsible Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Collaboration between teachers, department administrator, district support, and school based support to provide meaningful and targeted interventions for students aligned to formative assessment data and content standards.

Person Responsible Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Deliberate scheduling of students into courses and with teachers to provide interventions for addressing academic needs of students.

Person Responsible Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Due to the drop in proficiency levels across three of the four core content areas, afterschool tutoring has been implemented Monday - Thursday. This tutoring schedule will offer students additional support to master standards and improve course grades. The efforts will support students on their path to graduation and post-secondary success.

Measurable Outcome: Improved student grades
Reduction in number of course failures each quarter

Monitoring: Student attendance at tutoring sessions will be recorded to track usage. Grades of students that attend tutoring will be monitored to track improvement and/or need for intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Individualized or small group tutoring in core content areas based upon areas of need indicated in teacher or student self referral.
Afterschool remediation opportunities for standard-based content mastery.
Use of USA Test Prep for ELA, Science, and Social Studies
Use of IXL for Math courses

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The tutoring schedule allows for students to attend sessions with certified teachers in each of the four core content areas. Teachers, parents, and school staff have the ability to refer students to the educational support service. Offerings are scheduled to allow students to access core content instructional support in each area at least one-day a week. .

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The primary area of concern for discipline at SHS is to decrease the number of Drug/Public Order incidents which were reported as High at SHS - #349 out of 505 high schools statewide, #5 out of 7 in the county, and 2.48 per 100 students. This will be accomplished with increased monitoring of restrooms and other strategic areas on campus, signage with facts about the dangers of teen vaping, and restorative strategies for teen offenders.

The secondary area of concern for discipline at SHS is to decrease the number of incidents per 100 students. SHS ranks #264 out of 505 high schools statewide, #4 out of 7 high schools in the county, and 3.1 incidents per 100 students. SHS will enhance our college and career opportunities for students along with mental health support to meet the needs of our students. School culture is supported through the 4 tenets of respect, responsibility, resilience, and reliability. Our PBIS program supports, recognizes and rewards students and staff that embody the above characteristics.

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.

A focus on the climate and culture of Sarasota High is a driving force in the work of the school leadership team and all stakeholders. Through book studies, PLC work, PD opportunities, SAC and SDMT, and community partnerships with local foundations and entities, Sarasota High School teachers are engaged in deliberate PLC work to foster a culture of collaboration and professional growth. Through our PBIS team, that includes administrators, teachers, students, and parents, our school holds recognition events to honor students that demonstrate positive behaviors in class and on campus. Included in our mission is the preparation of students for higher learning and careers, to support that vision, we have partnered with the Education Foundation to open a Student Success Center. The SSC provides access to students for postsecondary planning, community service, and promotion of our extracurricular clubs and organizations. Additionally, the SSC partners with our local colleges and universities to conduct workshops and informational sessions for parents and students to assist in the application process for FAFSA and admissions to post-secondary institutions.

Student engagement in extracurricular clubs and organizations is an extension of the inclusive environment promoted at Sarasota High. Many of the clubs function in cooperation with community partners. Teachers

serve as advisors to foster community service, leadership development, academic success, and school community acceptance of diversity. Our school participates in an Unity Day event sponsored by a local non-profit, Embracing Our Differences. This event brings students, teachers, administrators, and community partners together to develop a culture of respect and acceptance.

Sarasota High School provides Parent and Family Engagement materials and trainings designed to provide assistance to parents and families in understanding challenging State academic standards, State and local academic assessments, how to monitor a child's progress, and how to work with educators to improve the achievement of their children at convenient, flexible times such as mornings and evenings as well as at-home/attendance zone visits to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students. Additionally, technology including social media and virtual meeting programs (Zoom, Teams, etc.) promote participation and awareness through live and recorded sessions to accommodate varying schedules. In addition, the district and school website contain links, resources, and materials, such as parent guides, study guides, practice assessments, student performance materials, and training to help parents and families work with their children to improve achievement.

The full text and summary of this Schoolwide Improvement Plan may be found online or as a hard copy by request. The Summary is available in English and [OTHER LANGUAGES]. Parent and families are regularly invited to attend Sarasota High SAC meetings to formulate suggestions and to participate, as appropriate, in decisions relating to the education of their children. Sarasota High School responds to any such suggestions as soon as practicably possible as evidenced by meeting minutes and notes. If this schoolwide improvement plan is not satisfactory to parents, parents/families are encouraged to submit such comments in writing so that the school can document and submit any parents' comments.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

School Administrators and Instructional Staff promote a positive culture and environment through the relationships they establish with their students. Teachers use the HERO behavior monitoring system to award points to students that exhibit the attributes of responsibility, respect, resilience, and reliability. Additionally, the instructional staff participates in a "Teacher of the Week" award. This award is given out each week to teachers that embody the SHS tenets. Teachers determine recipients week to week. Our PBIS Team meets monthly to organize the rewards for students that earn designated points through the here system. They also coordinate the passing of the Teacher of the Week award to be filmed by our student news.

SDMT and SAC support the efforts of our teachers and PBIS team by providing input and resources to enhance the rewards offered to students.

Students are involved in promoting positive culture and environment through their daily interactions with each other and school staff. Students have the ability to recognize teachers through a Anchored referral program.

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: Instructional Practice: Social Studies | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |

| | | | |
|--------|--------|--|--------|
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |