

Sarasota County Schools

North Port High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

North Port High School

6400 W PRICE BLVD, North Port, FL 34291

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/northporthigh

Demographics

Principal: Shannon Fusco

Start Date for this Principal: 9/10/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 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)	62%
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: B (60%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (60%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

North Port High School

6400 W PRICE BLVD, North Port, FL 34291

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/northporthigh

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 PK, 9-12	No	62%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

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

North Port High School will inspire tomorrow's leaders by providing rigorous instruction, maintaining a safe & respectful environment and developing socially responsible individuals in their community & beyond.

Provide the school's vision statement.

North Port High School will prepare students to lead responsible lives by supporting their intellectual, emotional, social, and physical development.

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
Fusco, Shannon	Principal	Oversight of the school, students, and leadership team
Copeland, Linda	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal over Curriculum. Over sight of all curriculum and PD. Directly supervises Social Studies
PELOPIDA, AGNES	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Administration
Appolloni, Courtney	Assistant Principal	Math
Corso, Ron	Assistant Principal	CTE
Thomas, Lee	School Counselor	Guidance Dept chair and Seniors
Backo, Autumn	Teacher, K-12	ELA teacher and dept chair
Hogue, Deborah	Teacher, K-12	Math dept chair and teacher
O'Gorman, Victoria	Teacher, ESE	ESE liaison and ESE dept chair
Alfano, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
Caracciolo, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	
Duque, Luz	Teacher, K-12	
Garmon, Jonathon	Behavior Specialist	
Luqman, Asiyah	Teacher, K-12	
Mano, Krista	Teacher, K-12	
Naeger, Sean	Teacher, K-12	
Pinna, Dennis	Teacher, K-12	
Thomas, Sheilah	Teacher, K-12	
Troyer, Nicholas	Teacher, K-12	
Slay, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 9/10/2022, Shannon Fusco

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.*

2

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

155

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,568

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

26

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

30

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	284	135	153	21	593

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	0	0	0	0	

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	0	31	38	26	9	104
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	6	0	20

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 9/10/2022

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	668	650	617	540	2475
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	57	14	22	13	106
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	52	68	13	184
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	58	59	14	191
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	107	90	72	359
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	74	65	0	239
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	94	98	64	38	294

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	21	30	28	7	86
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	7	16

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	668	650	617	540	2475	
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	57	14	22	13	106	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	52	68	13	184	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	58	59	14	191	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	107	90	72	359	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	74	65	0	239	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	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	94	98	64	38	294

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	21	30	28	7	86
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	7	16

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	55%	60%	51%				57%	67%	56%

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	51%						52%	53%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						46%	46%	42%
Math Achievement	48%	43%	38%				56%	63%	51%
Math Learning Gains	52%						59%	51%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						50%	48%	45%
Science Achievement	64%	56%	40%				70%	78%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	50%	48%				72%	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	70%	77%	-7%	67%	3%
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	70%	77%	-7%	70%	0%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	41%	73%	-32%	61%	-20%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	64%	69%	-5%	57%	7%

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	17	29	28	27	39	43	45	51		82	47
ELL	25	46	41	30	45	47	40	47		93	77
ASN	67	57		77	50		83	80		91	90
BLK	46	44	30	42	56	48	57	50		88	71
HSP	53	55	42	44	54	56	56	58		88	77
MUL	49	53	47	49	57	64	50	66		93	70
WHT	57	51	32	49	50	49	69	79		92	84
FRL	48	48	37	44	53	52	60	62		88	78
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	15	39	38	16	19	21	25	41		84	40
ELL	41	58	50	42	50	44	43	52		100	56
ASN	80	72		54	55						
BLK	35	48	44	25	30	43	35	56		95	57
HSP	58	57	37	38	29	18	56	64		95	78
MUL	46	48	50	44	40		59	81		100	68
WHT	62	56	38	50	36	26	69	71		95	81
FRL	50	51	39	40	30	25	56	64		95	73
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	23	35	29	26	55	37	36	36		71	29
ELL	19	44	48	33	59	20	39	53		100	61
ASN	60	53									
BLK	46	50	48	41	61	54	57	53		87	62
HSP	53	55	48	57	63	57	70	64		88	76
MUL	55	44	31	56	52	40	70	76		91	78
WHT	60	52	46	58	58	47	73	76		87	79
FRL	52	49	42	51	59	46	67	68		86	74

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	59
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	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	652
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
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	49
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	74
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	55
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	57
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	60
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	59
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?

All content areas saw an improvement in state assessments from the 2021 school year to the 2022 school year except in ELA. However, all content areas are below the district average .

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

Reading or ELA is an area of focus as all three areas decreased- Proficiency, Learning Gains, and Lowest Quartile Learning Gains. We will continue to have an emphasis on supporting our Students with Disabilities to improve achievement levels in that area.

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

ELA scores took a dip this year in both 9th and 10th grade. One reason for this decline is the long-term subs in multiple areas. New action is a focus on having a full-time staff in place with common Team time with a refined focus on the PLC process and common assessments. Continuation of implementation of district adopted resources. For Long-term substitutes are assigned a mentor to support teacher efficacy and promote best practices in teaching. Long-term substitutes also have common team planning to assist with lesson design and assessments.

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

Math is the most improved in terms of learning gains in terms of the lowest 25 percentile

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

Allocation of teachers to working with students after school and during the school day for remediation. Ongoing evaluation and tracking of students with an emphasis on students with several early warning indicators. An emphasis on placing more teachers who were highly effective teachers into classrooms with students in the bottom quartile. Increase in student attendance on assessment dates.

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

Continued focus on common assessments and remediation and/or acceleration for all subject areas. Focus on acceleration data for students to participate in advanced course work ex. Pre-AICE PE

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.

Continued emphasis on the PLC process with teams choosing essential standards and having a focus on the why of learning to lead lesson planning. ILT teams will continue to work on Visible Learning with a focus on reading strategies.. Increased participation in district PD with our reading staff to support students who require tier three interventions. Professional development from district to support teacher efficacy in all core subjects.

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

Continued Emphasis on PLCs

- * Data chats around Benchmark Assessments
- * Focus on standards-based curriculum and instruction
- * District instructional coaches who will work with teachers on lesson planning

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 Professional Learning Communities**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

ELA achieve at North Port High School fell to 55%. The district average was 62%. Our focus will be to increase teacher efficacy to improve student learning. By focusing on refining our PLC process with a data focused on essential standards, teachers will have the ability to refine their practice and improve student learning outcomes by being able to identify areas of need in student learning and remediation and/or acceleration needed.

Measurable**Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By 2023, ELA achievement will increase from 55% to 59%

Monitoring:**Describe how this**

Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

FAST progress monitoring and team based common assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Copeland (linda.copeland@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The strategy this year is based around improved PLC practices centered around the 4 questions for student learning (what we want students to know, how do we know when they know it, what to do if they need support, and what to do when students have learned the concept). These strategies will focus on the following: common assessments, Data-based instruction, and improved tiered interventions practice

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Improved PLC practice shows a growth in student learning as illustrated in Learning by Doing by Dufour
Common Assessment, data-focused instruction and interventions all show a increased effect size in student learning from John Hattie's research on Visible Learning

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.

Evidence based strategies on improved team discussions to support student learning revolving around the 4 questions (what we want students to learn, how do we know when they have learned it, what to do when they have it, what to do when they need more support). Teams will identify yearlong focus standards and implement them on team lesson plans and common assessments to inform instruction. Professional

development on learning intention and success criteria to support teacher focus and student understanding. Professional development on reading strategies to improve student outcomes.

Person Responsible Linda Copeland (linda.copeland@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.

To improve ELA Learning gains and bottom quartile achievement. ELA Learning gains was at 51% with the district at 56% and ELA bottom quartile was at 6% compared to the district's 43%.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA Learning Gains will increase from 51% to 55% and bottom quartile will increase from 36% to 40%

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

FAST progress monitoring. Common assessments along with lesson plans and classroom observations

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shannon Fusco (shannon.fusco@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The strategy this year during our PLC refinement will focus on common assessments and data informed instruction to improve student learning. We will improve our tiered intervention practices through progress monitoring. We will also continue the process of collaborating with ESE team members to ensure interventions are in place

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Improved PLC practice shows a growth in student learning as illustrated in Learning by Doing by Dufour. Common assessments, data-driven instruction and interventions all show a positive effect size in student learning from John Hattie's research on Visible Learning. Also, by increasing our focus on our SWD population, we will directly impact student educational growth.

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.

Along with our core area teachers, our ESE teams will be given 1/2 day training sessions on understanding the 4 questions to effective teams and to improve student outcomes. The team will work collaboratively to monitor student academic and behavioral growth. Research teachers along with behavior specialists and Liassons will take a multi-task approach to supporting our SWD students by monitoring attendance, academics, and behavior. Teams will have professional development on learning intentions and success criteria. School-wide professional development offering on improved literacy practices as it relates to visible learning. Linda Copeland will monitor the professional development and data for student growth. Shannon Fusco will monitor classroom practice.

Person Responsible

Shannon Fusco (shannon.fusco@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3. 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.

Although math achievement has seen improvement from the prior year's assessment data, it is still below the district average. North Port High School math achievement is at 48% while the district is at 61%

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Math achievement will grow from 48% to 52%

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

District benchmarks and team based common assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Copeland (linda.copeland@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The strategy is based around aligning our instruction around focus standards and improving our team team practice. Common assessments is a goal and focus for all of math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Common assessments with a data focused instruction show increased effect size in student learning according to John Hattie's research in Visible Learning.

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.

PLC 1/2 day team PD on focus standards and common assessments. Teams will identify year-long focus standards and implement them in lesson design and common assessments. Teams will also take part in Learning Intentions and Success Criteria to support student learning. Further action steps are support from district program specialists, administrators, and team members.

Person Responsible

Courtney Appolloni
(courtney.appolloni@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student behavior**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Although North Port High School saw improved data on student incidents in many areas, students still need additional support.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our goal is to decrease our student suspension incidents from 179 (for the total year) to 169.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Discipline meetings using current OSS data from the district.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

AGNES PELOPIDA (agnes.pelopida@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Evidence-based strategy is to add additional support for students needing behavioral interventions and support. Staffing has been allocated to assist in student goal setting, behavior contracts, mentoring, attendance, and Drop-out Prevention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Studies have indicated that student learning outcomes and behaviors improve when there are several areas of support and professionals who meet regularly with the youth to set goals and build relationships.

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.

Behavior specialists are supporting our ESE students and monitoring their progress both academically and behaviorally. Our school has added a dropout prevention specialist to monitor student attendance and academics. In addition, we have added two behavior technicians to meet regularly with at risk students to progress monitor and goal set. PBIS is implemented to support students' behavioral growth by awarding HERO points to award positive behaviors.

Person Responsible

AGNES PELOPIDA (agnes.pelopida@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.

PBIS is implemented to support students' behavioral growth. Students are nominated by teachers for behavioral awards (or PAWS), quarterly celebrations for academics, HERO points are awarded for following behavioral expectations and are weekly rewarded. Character Strong implementation to give students opportunities to do scenario-based interactions to improve interactions and decrease conflicts. Drop Out Prevention Coaches to support students who are at risk. Student Success Coaches to give students opportunities to visit colleges and learn about career opportunities. Support staff with PLC 1/2 days to meet as a team to decide upon common pedagogical approaches and to cultivate team efficacy.

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

Courtney Appolloni -PBIS coordinator and Character Strong
Linda Copeland- PLC and staff professional development coordinator
Shannon Fusco-Principal