Venice Senior High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Venice Senior High School

1 INDIAN AVE, Venice, FL 34285

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/venicehigh

Demographics

Principal: Zoltan Kerestely

Start Date for this Principal: 6/26/2021

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	33%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (63%) 2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (71%)
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

Venice Senior High School

1 INDIAN AVE, Venice, FL 34285

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/venicehigh

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	33%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	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.

Venice High School in partnership with the entire community, will empower every student to become a lifelong learner who is responsible, productive and engaged citizen within a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is achieving at his or her maximum potential in an engaging, inspiring learning environment.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kerestely, Zoltan	Principal	
Gallof, Lindsay	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Master Schedule, Professional Development, ELA Department
Shurley, Ryan	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Administration, Safety and Security, Facilities and Operations, Math and World Languages Departments, Athletic Programs, PBIS, Schoolwide Discipline
Gruhl, Mathew	Assistant Principal	Student Academics and Discipline Alpha A-G, History and PE Department, Attendance, Student Orientation, Parking
Tanaka, Danielle	Assistant Principal	Student Academics and Discipline Alpha P-Z, CTE and Arts Departments, Student Clubs and Organizations
Schmidt, Rosemary	Assistant Principal	Student Academics and Discipline Alpha H-O, ESE Department, Transportation

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 6/26/2021, Zoltan Kerestely

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

16

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

123

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,579

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	675	653	664	589	2581
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	142	128	149	578
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	35	27	19	162
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	39	48	32	151
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	41	25	8	107
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	73	87	0	263
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	161	100	84	28	373

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	2	16	23	21	15	77
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4	14	34

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/9/2022

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	616	679	631	551	2477
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219	184	188	167	758
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	18	11	7	79
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	59	48	50	228
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	15	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	58	44	35	25	162

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	5	13	10	11	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	1	15

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	616	679	631	551	2477
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219	184	188	167	758
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	18	11	7	79
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	59	48	50	228
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	15	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	58	44	35	25	162

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	5	13	10	11	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	1	15

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	63%	60%	51%				67%	67%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						50%	53%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						39%	46%	42%
Math Achievement	62%	43%	38%				72%	63%	51%
Math Learning Gains	46%						49%	51%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						47%	48%	45%
Science Achievement	76%	56%	40%				82%	78%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	50%	48%				88%	81%	73%

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

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
2022					
2019	81%	77%	4%	67%	14%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	86%	77%	9%	70%	16%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	64%	73%	-9%	61%	3%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	72%	69%	3%	57%	15%

Subgroup Data Review

										2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	22	44	41	33	34	30	40	45		87	36
ELL	39	49	50	61	47	50	46	50		80	56
ASN	69	54		86	50		92			100	88
BLK				20						88	40
HSP	57	53	47	54	43	33	62	76		88	56
MUL	72	73	85	56	46		68	69		97	57
WHT	64	56	44	63	47	44	79	79		95	66
FRL	50	47	38	52	42	41	67	67		90	53

										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	29	39	39	53	36	39	43	50		82	33
ELL	32	60	58	57	45		38			75	
ASN	50	38					75				
BLK								42		100	36
HSP	48	49	54	67	47	69	72	75		86	45
MUL	62	62	23	56	35		76	75		92	65
WHT	65	56	47	69	38	51	82	84		97	72
FRL	48	44	39	61	45	59	71	71		92	61

										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	33	31	21	28	28	15	45	56		89	17
ELL	23	37	45	64	62					73	
ASN	86	40		86	54		92			100	64
BLK	53	35		60						100	40
HSP	56	43	45	64	41	39	71	83		91	49
MUL	57	56	36	63	39		79	72		96	56
WHT	69	51	39	73	50	48	84	89		93	57
FRL	56	44	37	62	43	42	74	83		89	46

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	702
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	69
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	64
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Since 2019, ELA learning gains and lowest 25% ELA learning gains increased, while all other school grade components decreased. Since 2021, all ELA components increased, Math learning gains increased, Math achievement and lowest 25% Math learning gains decreased, and Science and Social Studies achievement decreased.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Overall math achievement and math bottom quartile growth are the data components that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

Scheduling has played a major factor in missed opportunity for growth and proficiency in math by scheduling many of them in Alg 1 a/b over two years. By scheduling more students in Alg 1 and the Alg 1 a/b block they will take the Alg 1 EOC the same year they are exposed to the first half of the course and

count towards growth by taking statewide assessments in consecutive years. These students are also being supported through block scheduling of Alg 1a/b and push-in support.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA lowest 25% learning gains has increased 8 points since 2019.

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

Scheduling all level 1 and 2 students in Intensive Reading has contributed to our increase in our lowest 25% ELA Learning Gains. In addition, we have hired an ELA interventionist to work with our ELA and IR teachers to review data and provide interventions to struggling learners.

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

Teachers will be working in PLCs to implement the MTSS process; review student data, identify groups of students with common deficits, plan interventions, and identify tools to monitor the impact of these interventions. Teachers will decide what students should be learning through a study of their course standards and create common assessments. Based on their student data, teachers will discuss intervention options or enrichment for students already demonstrating proficiency.

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.

Aligned with the SCS Strategic Plan, VHS is using the PLC process to guide instruction in the classroom. Teachers will be trained on SIMS, No Red Ink, and participate in a book study based in "Cultures Built to Last".

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

Sustainability will be insured by providing school wide training on the PLC process. Teachers will participate in a book study that focuses on creating a culture that promotes learning for all. Our MTSS process and PBIS plan will be embedded in our PLC discussions.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Math Achievement decreased 5 points since 2021 and 10 points since 2019. A passing score on the Algebra EOC is a graduation requirement and therefore an area of critical need.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Venice High School's mathematics proficiency will increase from 62% to 66% in SY 2023.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Algebra and Geometry teachers will use ALEKS to monitor proficiency and use this data in their PLCs to identify students with similar needs and provide targeted interventions to increase proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ryan Shurley (ryan.shurley@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The main strategy being used for this area of focus is Collective Teacher Efficacy through the PLC process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The PLC process creates schoolwide Collective Teacher Efficacy, which has an effect size of 1.57 on student growth. As teachers work through the PLC process, their focus on learning, goals, and results, will improve teacher efficacy and student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Create a guiding coalition to lead the PLC implementation and create a master schedule that ensures common planning times by subject/tested area.

Person Responsible	Lindsay Gallof (lindsay.gallof@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Plan and schedule book study on the Introduction to PLC: Cultures Built to Last

Person Responsible	Lindsay Gallof (lindsay.gallof@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Teachers will implement quarterly progress monitoring of interventions through our PLCs and data team meetings using the VHS data reflection guide.

Person Responsible	Robert Lash (robert.lash@sarasotacountyschools.net)

A math instructional facilitator and interventionist will push in to classes to work with small groups of students with common skill or knowledge deficits.

Person Responsible	Lindsay Gallof (lindsay.gallof@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Teachers will implement high impact tier 1 core instruction aligned with course standards.

Person Responsible	Robert Lash (robert.lash@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	ELA Achievement decreased 4 points since 2019. A passing score on the 10 grade FSA is a graduation requirement and therefore an area of critical need.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Venice High School's 10 grade ELA proficiency will increase from 63% to 67% in SY 2023.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	ELA teachers will use FAST results to monitor proficiency and use the VHS data reflection guide in their PLCs to identify students with similar needs and determine targeted interventions to increase proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lindsay Gallof (lindsay.gallof@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The main strategy being used for this area of focus is Collective Teacher Efficacy through PLC process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The PLC process creates schoolwide Collective Teacher Efficacy, which has an effect size of 1.57 on student growth. As teachers work through the PLC process, their focus on learning, goals, and results, will improve teacher efficacy and student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

SIMS Learning Strategies Professional Development - ELA 9-10 teachers are word mapping, creating common assessments, and fundamentals/proficiency sentence writing.

Person Responsible	Deborah Therrien (deborah.therrien@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Teachers will use No Red Ink to create and administer common assessments aligned with course standards. They will use this assessment data in their PLCs to monitor progress and plan interventions.

Person Responsible	Deborah Therrien (deborah.therrien@sarasotacountyschools.net)

ELA instructional facilitator will push into English and Reading classes to provide differentiated core tier 1 instruction and small group tier 2 interventions.

Person Responsible	Deborah Therrien (deborah.therrien@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The Federal Index for SWD at VHS was 41%, a decrease from the 20-21 school year of 3 percent. For the 21-22 school year, ELA proficiency for SWD was 22% which is 41% lower than for non SWD students. Math proficiency was 33% which was 29% lower than for non SWD students.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	For the 22-23 school year, SWD proficiency for ELA will increase to 26% and SWD proficiency for math will increase to 37%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	ELA teachers will use FAST results to monitor proficiency and use this data in their PLCs to identify students with similar needs and provide targeted interventions to increase proficiency. Algebra and Geometry teachers will use ALEKS to monitor proficiency and use this data in their PLCs to identify students with similar needs and provide targeted interventions to increase proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rosemary Schmidt (rosemary.schmidt@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	All SWD who are level 1 or 2 readers, or who have direct instruction in reading as an IEP goal have been scheduled in an ILA course. We have also hired an ELA interventionist to work with our ELA and IR teachers to review data and provide interventions to struggling learners. Our SWD level 1 and 2 math students are being supported through push-in support by our math interventionist in Alg 1a/b and Geometry classes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Providing ILA as tier 1 core instruction for our struggling readers ensures that they have daily support to target their reading deficits. The addition of our ELA interventionist helps to bridge this deficit of grade level standards in their English 1 or 2 class through tier 2 small group instruction. Our math interventionist also provides tier 2 small group instruction to SWD students who are working below grade level to help target key skill deficits they have in math.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Schedule level 1 and 2 reading and math students in ILA and supported Alg 1 a/b and Geometry classes classes.

Person Responsible   Lindsay Gallof (lindsay.gallof@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Hire ELA and Math Interventionists.

Person Responsible   Lindsay Gallof (lindsay.gallof@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Coordinate push-in support schedule where interventionists can participate in common planning with ELA, ILA, Alg 1 and Geometry teachers and push in to support learners with common deficits of grade level standards.

Person Responsible   Rosemary Schmidt (rosemary.schmidt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Focusing on positive behaviors and interventions for students through the tenants of Respect, Responsible, and Safe has been paramount to creating a safe and healthy school culture and environment focused on teaching and learning.

Venice High School first launched our Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports program (PBIS) in 2017 to teach students desired social and emotional behaviors resulting in reductions of reported bullying, student suspension, and chronic absenteeism through our message: Be responsible, respectful, and safe.

At VHS our PBIS team and leadership class has embraced diversity throughout the school year. We have had many guest speakers share experiences showcasing their diversity, life experience, and overall knowledge to enhance the leadership curriculum. This will help our leadership students accept others and share their gained knowledge by actionable items in the community and around the school. The Leadership students have also endured a challenging curriculum with monthly subtopics to enhance their knowledge on overall leadership values. They have planned several events for the IND students and have formed friendships by participating in weekly team-building exercises.

Additionally, our PBIS team and Leadership course are promoting monthly character education traits in alignment with the state's character education initiative. Finally, our PBIS team worked with our Social Committee to create staff spirit days. During these spirit days, teachers wore different items from travels and even family heirlooms to engage an open dialogue with students about diversity and culture. Lastly, our students found creative ways to celebrate successes among students and staff by small tokens of appreciation, recognition, and awards. This year Venice High School added a leadership class. Identification of students by Instructional staff to enroll in the Leadership class on campus and be a part of PBIS.

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

At the tier 1 level, our PBIS team is comprised of administration, classroom teachers, support staff, parents and students to ensure a balanced perspective and input in promoting a positive school culture and

environment through schoolwide communication the student handbook, signage and messaging around campus, the morning news and grade level assemblies. Our PBIS team creates clear expectations for all learners and helps promote positive behaviors by creating rewards for and incentives for students that exhibit positive behaviors on campus.

At the tier 2 and 3 level our Project 10 team, SWST team, and PBIS teams used schoolwide and classroom data to identify students in need of small group or individualized academic or behavioral support, plan interventions such as Check in Check out and Project 10 Mentoring, and monitor these supports for effectiveness. Our administrators, teachers, and counselors help facilitate these teams.