
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Sarasota Military Academy

801 N ORANGE AVE, Sarasota, FL 34236

www.sarasotamilitaryacademy.org

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Within a culture where every cadet is valued, Sarasota Military Academy is committed to:

- Preparing students for College, Careers, and Citizenship;
- Developing tomorrow's leaders; and
- Cultivating Character based upon the steadfast values of Honor, Integrity, and Respect.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To equip cadets with the skills, values, and education that will enable them to lead productive and fulfilling lives. Parent and family engagement is a shared responsibility and encourages student success.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bowman, Christina	Principal	
Vara, Thomas	Principal	
Williams, Abby	Assistant Principal	
West, Caitlin	Assistant Principal	
Korwin, Cheryl	Assistant Principal	
Sudbury, Dawn	Teacher, K-12	
Wyka, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Ferradino, Cecilia	Teacher, K-12	
Catena, Jennifer	Behavior Specialist	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholder involvement will include members of the administrative team, teachers, support staff, Parents from our PTCC, and cadet counsel. We will also reference the Parents, students, and staff surveys to gain valuable information in the decision-making process.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP plan is part of our Academy goals as well as our overall strategic plan and will be monitored quarterly by the teachers, department chairs, and the administrative team.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	54%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	58%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	50	59	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	17	37
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	39	47	101
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	67	71	158
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	49	49	124
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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	0	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	128	181	359

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	43	51	362
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	9	99
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4	56
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	19	26	96
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	37	43	236
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	39	32	151
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4	56

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	66	75	738

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	43	51	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	9	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	19	26	61
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	37	43	111
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	39	32	118
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4	15

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	66	75	208

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	43	58	50	49	60	51	52		
ELA Learning Gains				43			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				27			37		
Math Achievement*	43	49	38	47	43	38	48		
Math Learning Gains				46			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			27		
Science Achievement*	51	73	64	45	56	40	51		
Social Studies Achievement*	72	75	66	71	50	48	74		
Middle School Acceleration	73			70	45	44	70		
Graduation Rate	93	89	89	97	71	61	94		
College and Career Acceleration	25	74	65	35	74	67	35		
ELP Progress	45	55	45	41			50		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	93

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	611
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	97

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	45			
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	61			
BLK	32	Yes	2	
HSP	50			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	50			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	2	1
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	27	Yes	1	1
HSP	46			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	43			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	43			43			51	72	73	93	25	45
SWD	18			24			34	50	73	15	7	
ELL	27			32			22	51	59	22	8	45
AMI												
ASN	67			55							2	
BLK	24			17			33	54			4	
HSP	34			38			37	62	67	25	8	43
MUL	61			50			60	88			4	
PAC												
WHT	49			49			64	82	78	28	7	
FRL	36			38			42	64	63	22	8	44

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	49	43	27	47	46	40	45	71	70	97	35	41
SWD	23	25	21	19	30	34	19	40	30	94	7	
ELL	32	39	38	31	39	39	25	53	71	100	0	41
AMI												
ASN	91	73		73	50							
BLK	19	26	12	13	4	7	6	63		90		
HSP	41	39	30	39	41	31	38	59	71	91	33	41
MUL	65	52		70	56		60	91				
PAC												
WHT	56	47	29	54	53	57	53	77	68	100	38	
FRL	42	38	23	38	42	35	32	61	58	93	18	33

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	52	47	37	48	31	27	51	74	70	94	35	50
SWD	18	31	29	19	24	26	18	38		96	5	
ELL	36	38	27	35	26	22	18	42	73	97	14	50
AMI												
ASN	75	54		75	40		69	90	90			
BLK	33	39	38	18	22	23	30	65				
HSP	46	44	29	40	28	27	37	62	67	95	27	43
MUL	59	42		74	43							
PAC												
WHT	58	50	46	54	33	27	64	83	71	94	43	
FRL	45	44	36	41	27	25	45	70	60	94	25	55

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	51%	58%	-7%	50%	1%
07	2023 - Spring	28%	55%	-27%	47%	-19%
08	2023 - Spring	44%	55%	-11%	47%	-3%
09	2023 - Spring	53%	59%	-6%	48%	5%
06	2023 - Spring	31%	54%	-23%	47%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	43%	61%	-18%	54%	-11%
07	2023 - Spring	28%	67%	-39%	48%	-20%
08	2023 - Spring	26%	54%	-28%	55%	-29%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	39%	55%	-16%	44%	-5%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	65%	-4%	50%	11%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	43%	59%	-16%	48%	-5%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	71%	-2%	63%	6%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	79%	-4%	66%	9%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	72%	-3%	63%	6%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

We saw a drop in middle school and high school ELA + Math achievement, learning gains, and the lowest 25% as well as ESSA subgroups SWD/Black population.

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

Middle school and high school ELA + Math achievement, learning gains, and the lowest 25%.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

8th-grade Math achievement showed the largest gap (19%) when compared to the state 2023 FAST scores. One contributing factor was our 8th-grade Math teacher missed significant time during the school year due to health reasons. The need for more one-on-one assistance and goal setting for our students.

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

10th grade ELA achievement increased from 37% to 51% proficiency. There was a direct focus on individual learning gains as well as reviewing previous data for each cadet. Teachers and cadets tracked their progress and conducted data chats to improve learning.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

- Students with Disabilities
- Black student population

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

- Students with Disabilities
- Black student population
- ELA Achievement
- Math Achievement
- Lowest 25%

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In 2022, SMA showed SWD and the Black subgroup fell below the federal index. This is observed to still be the case based on 2023 FAST results. Although the black subgroup remains small in population, FAST results may indicate just a small number of students that need intensive instruction. Instructors will receive professional development for the use of Thinking Maps and will be implemented school wide.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Measurable outcomes include an increase to a baseline of 41% or higher in learning gains of SWD and black subgroups measured through 2024 FAST results.

Monitoring:

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

Quarterly progress monitoring using PM1 + PM2, Studysync, Power-up, USA test Prep benchmarks, and data review to conduct relevant, individual learning goals. Students will maintain their own datasheets containing 2023 FAST results and PM1 + PM2, Power-up, and USA test Prep performance data and establish specific learning goals facilitated with teacher support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tom Vara (tom.vara@oursma.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Data-driven, data conferences, and student ownership of learning through learner-centered data sheets created by the learner. This strategy is based on Hattie's Assessment-Capable Visible Learners approach "Visible learners... understand where they're going and have the confidence to take on the challenge."

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Focusing on three of Hattie's High Impact Teaching Strategies (HITS) as applied to students taking ownership of their own data.

1. Setting Goals- Based on student's analysis of progress monitoring and FSA achievement data, teacher and student set individualized learning goals measurable within the PM and FSA results.
2. Feedback- Data conferencing provides an opportunity for teachers and students to discuss data.
3. Metacognitive strategies- Students become "experts" in understanding their data, strategies for reaching goals, and developing a focus on growth and achievement (open vs. fixed mindset).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Administration provides core teachers with user-friendly data sheets (by class) showing relevant data points at a glance to easily identify areas of growth for members of a subgroup and the individual needs of learners within that group. PM1 + PM2 for checkpoints.

Person Responsible: Tom Vara (tom.vara@oursma.org)

By When: Progress monitoring will take place after PM1 + PM2 and the final results will be PM3.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In 2022, SMA showed SWD and the Black subgroup fell below the federal index. This is observed to still be the case based on 2023 FAST results. Although the black subgroup remains small in population, FAST results may indicate just a small number of students that need intensive instruction. Instructors will receive professional development for the use of Thinking Maps and will be implemented school wide.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Measurable outcomes include an increase to a baseline of 41% or higher in learning gains of SWD and black subgroups measured through 2024 FAST results.

Monitoring:

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

Quarterly progress monitoring using PM1 + PM2, Studysync, Power-up, USA test Prep benchmarks, and data review to conduct relevant, individual learning goals. Students will maintain their own datasheets containing 2023 FAST results and PM1 + PM2, Power-up, and USA test Prep performance data and establish specific learning goals facilitated with teacher support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tom Vara (tom.vara@oursma.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Data-driven, data conferences, and student ownership of learning through learner-centered data sheets created by the learner. This strategy is based on Hattie's Assessment-Capable Visible Learners approach "Visible learners... understand where they're going and have the confidence to take on the challenge."

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Focusing on three of Hattie's High Impact Teaching Strategies (HITS) as applied to students taking ownership of their own data.

1. Setting Goals- Based on student's analysis of progress monitoring and FSA achievement data, teacher and student set individualized learning goals measurable within the PM and FSA results.
2. Feedback- Data conferencing provides an opportunity for teachers and students to discuss data.
3. Metacognitive strategies- Students become "experts" in understanding their data, strategies for reaching goals, and developing a focus on growth and achievement (open vs. fixed mindset).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Administration provides core teachers with user-friendly data sheets (by class) showing relevant data points at a glance to easily identify areas of growth for members of a subgroup and the individual needs of learners within that group. PM1 + PM2 for checkpoints.

Person Responsible: Tom Vara (tom.vara@oursma.org)

By When: Progress monitoring will take place after PM1 + PM2 and the final results will be PM3.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Improve the Math achievement, Math learning gains, and Math learning gains of the lowest 25%. This data was retrieved from the 2023 FAST report.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Each area will improve the level of proficiency with a minimum of 4% growth in math achievement, Math learning gains, and Math learning gains of the lowest 25%.

Monitoring:

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

Quarterly progress monitoring using PM1, PM2, Big Ideas Math, IXL benchmarks, and data review to drive relevant, individual learning goals. Students will maintain their own datasheets containing 2023 FAST results and PM1 + PM2 results to establish specific learning goals facilitated by teacher support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tom Vara (tom.vara@oursma.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Hattie's High Impact Teaching Strategies (HITS) have emerged from the findings of tens of thousands of studies on what has worked in classrooms across the US and the world. Experts often rank HITS at the top of strategies that contribute to student learning. Tier III small-group interventions are provided weekly during the school day and by appointment after school for the lowest quartile.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implementation of Hattie's High Impact Teaching Strategies (HITS). Three specific strategies support the assessment literacy of both teachers and students and have shown evidence of impacting student learning gains.

1. Setting Goals- Lessons have clear learning intentions with goals that clarify what success looks like. Lesson goals always explain what students need to understand, and what they must be able to do.
2. Feedback informs a student and/or teacher about the student's performance relative to learning goals. Feedback redirects teacher and student actions so the student can align effort and activity with a clear the outcome that leads to achieving a learning goal.
3. Metacognitive strategies teach students to think about their own thinking. When students become aware of the learning process, they gain control over their learning. Metacognition extends to self-regulation or managing one's own motivation toward learning. Metacognitive activities include planning how to approach learning tasks, evaluating progress, and monitoring comprehension.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

1. Review HITS to faculty and complete a Quarter 1 inventory of fidelity of implementation
2. Monitor successful implementation through general observation and progress monitoring from PM1 + PM2
3. Strategy is working if "teachers demonstrate" (specific to strategy)
4. Strategy is working if "students demonstrate" (specific to strategy)

Person Responsible: Tom Vara (tom.vara@oursma.org)

By When: The plan will be reviewed after PM1 + PM2 and the end result will be PM3

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Hire and retain highly effective instructors that will directly impact student achievement, specifically for SWD, and the African-American student population.

All new staff members will participate in a year-long structured teacher mentor program.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Analyze PM1 baseline data and review with students and establish individual goals. PM2 will see an increase of an average 15 points. PM3 will see an increase of an average of 20 points.

Increase the number of HE instructors by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring through PM1, 2 and 3.

Classroom progress monitoring.

Data chats

Ongoing staff observations with supports in place as needed.

Completion of IPDP for all instructors.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christina Bowman (christina.bowman@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Professional Development focused on research-based instructional strategies: Thinking Maps

Utilize on a consistent basis:

Systemic and explicit instruction

Visual representations

Peer-assisted instruction

Ongoing, formative assessments

Intensive instruction; One-on-one instruction, small group instruction

Gradual release

Provide immediate and descriptive feedback

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Consistent utilization of PBIS.

MTSS/SWST Tier Strategies are consistent and found to be effective.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

All new staff members will participate in a year-long structured teacher mentor program as well as continued relevant PD for all staff members. There will be monthly meetings for all staff to gain feedback to improve the culture of the academy. The Parent, Teacher, Cadet Council (PTCC) for both campuses meets monthly and provides activities throughout the year for parent participation and communicates the Academy's progress and needs. Parents receive weekly email newsletter communications regarding upcoming events and activities. Social media also shares important activities, accomplishments, and community engagements. The PTCC also plays a vital role in supporting our teachers and their needs in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Tom Vara (tom.vara@oursma.org)

By When: Monthly meetings and full-year evaluation of performance and the culture of the academy.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The SIP will be reviewed monthly and funding allocations will be identified as needed.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****Monitoring****Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

NA

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
 List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

NA

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

NA

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

NA

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

NA

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

NA

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

NA

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes