# Student Leadership Academy School



**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

# Table of Contents

# Student Leadership Academy

### 200 FIELD AVE E, Venice, FL 34285

### www.studentleadershipacademy.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.**

The mission of The Student Leadership Academy of Venice is to provide a community- based academic and social environment that will promote Scholarship in adolescents by encouraging them to discover and develop their individual talents and to recognize that reading is a requisite skill for scholarship in all areas. To create stimulating opportunities for students to develop Leadership skills and, to instill in its students, the value of volunteerism through Service learning. Our hope is to streamline communication between school and home.
Parent and family engagement is a shared responsibility. Parent and family engagement encourages high quality instruction for all learners.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The Student Leadership Academy of Venice's motto: "Scholarship, Leadership, Service" best describes the philosophy and underlying vision of the school. Students will be encouraged to achieve at their highest level of ability. A small learning community will enable teachers to know their students and to understand the challenge level of each child. Utilization of innovative teaching methods will offer unique learning opportunities and experiences in and beyond the classroom.

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Cooley, Jonathan | Principal | Administrator responsible for monitoring and evaluating program's effectiveness, provide additional support and how the SIP is being utilized by the instructional staff. |
| Hunt, Katie | Assistant Principal | Administrator responsible for implementation, support, and effectiveness of the MTSS/RTI program and professional development for MTSS team members and instructional staff. |
| McNeil, Jamie | Teacher, ESE | Responsible for organizing agenda and meetings, provides support to teachers/ teams for interventions/parent contacts/student information and observations of ESE and Pre-ESE students. Provides additional support to teachers and students. |
| Clinch, Casey | Teacher, K-12 | Intensive Reading Teacher and Head of ELA Department. Helps design and implement Tier II and III Interventions for ELA. |

**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.

The development of the SIP for Student Leadership Academy included the school leadership team, teachers, and staff. The SAC (with all required stakeholders) will review and provide input for the SIP plan.

**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 will reviewed with the leadership team and at SAC meetings. Updates on progress monitoring will be shared with stakeholders. Revisions will be made as necessary and once new data is made available, especially with regards to Areas of Focus.

| 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) | Middle School 6-8 |
| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | No |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 15% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 32% |
| **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)* 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A |

| 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 | 7 | 16 | 25 | 48 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 11 | 21 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 19 | 41 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 11 |
| 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 | |

**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 | 15 | 8 | 35 | 58 |

**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 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 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 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 69 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 25 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 10 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 12 | 25 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 21 |
| 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 | |

**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 | 13 | 28 | 24 | 65 |

**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 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

### 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 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 69 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 25 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 10 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 12 | 25 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 21 |
| 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 | |

**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 | 13 | 28 | 24 | 65 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Grade Level | | | | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 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* | 61 | 57 | 49 | 67 | 57 | 50 | 67 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 50 | | | 56 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 32 | | | 39 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 90 | 64 | 56 | 81 | 38 | 36 | 80 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 71 | | | 66 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 71 | | | 67 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 72 | 56 | 49 | 75 | 64 | 53 | 68 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 85 | 81 | 68 | 87 | 60 | 58 | 91 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 66 | 73 | 73 | 64 | 51 | 49 | 60 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 55 | 49 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | 83 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 57 | 40 | | 76 | 76 | | | |

*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 | 75 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 374 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 66 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 598 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

## 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 | 35 | Yes | 2 | |
| ELL | 50 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 66 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 76 | | | |

| 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% |
| FRL | 64 | | | |

| 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 | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 67 | | | |
| MUL | 78 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | | | |
| FRL | 62 | | | |

## 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 | 61 | | | 90 | | | 72 | 85 | 66 | | | |
| SWD | 26 | | | 52 | | | 15 | 45 | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 10 | | | 90 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | | | 92 | | | 58 | | | | 3 | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

### 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | | | 89 | | | 73 | 84 | 69 | | 5 | |
| FRL | 53 | | | 85 | | | 60 | 78 | 46 | | 5 | |

### 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 | 67 | 50 | 32 | 81 | 71 | 71 | 75 | 87 | 64 | | | |
| SWD | 18 | 25 | 24 | 36 | 59 | 48 | 27 | 50 | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 56 | 45 | | 75 | 59 | | 62 | 92 | 80 | | | |
| MUL | 73 | | | 82 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 49 | 32 | 81 | 70 | 71 | 75 | 86 | 63 | | | |
| FRL | 64 | 41 | 31 | 81 | 67 | 71 | 70 | 81 | 56 | | | |

### 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 | 67 | 56 | 39 | 80 | 66 | 67 | 68 | 91 | 60 | | | |
| SWD | 20 | 21 | 13 | 40 | 63 | 50 | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 58 | 53 | 43 | 76 | 72 | 75 | 50 | 100 | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 57 | 38 | 80 | 66 | 63 | 71 | 88 | 64 | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 49 | 20 | 69 | 53 | 58 | 67 | 85 | 39 | | | |

**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 |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 61% | 55% | 6% | 47% | 14% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 54% | 55% | -1% | 47% | 7% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 64% | 54% | 10% | 47% | 17% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 97% | 61% | 36% | 54% | 43% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 90% | 67% | 23% | 48% | 42% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 68% | 54% | 14% | 55% | 13% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 70% | 55% | 15% | 44% | 26% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 65% | 35% | 50% | 50% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 84% | 79% | 5% | 66% | 18% |

# III. Planning for Improvement

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

The area demonstrating the greatest need for improvement is students demonstrating proficiency in English Language Arts. Overall, 60% of students were proficient on FAST Reading in 2023 compared with 67% of students being proficient on FSA Reading in 2022. Contributing factors include a new test based on BEST standards and ESSA group SWD that struggles to make gains in English Language Arts.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline is students demonstrating proficiency on Grade 8 Reading. In 2022, 68% of 8th grade students demonstrated proficiency on FSA ELA compared to 54% of 8th grade students demonstrating proficiency on FAST Reading. Factors contributing to this decline may have been the writing component of FSA that helped students that may have struggled with reading but were more proficient with writing.

**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.**

The data component with greatest gap compared to the state average would be ESSA group SWD achieving proficiency in English Language Arts. In 2022, 18% of SWD achieved proficiency on FSA ELA compared with the state at 24%. In 2023, 12% of SWD achieved proficiency on FAST Reading. SWD continues to be a group that shows deficits, although 21% demonstrated learning gains in Reading. The transition to FAST that assessed BEST standards contributed to these scores and students with significant reading deficits.

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

The area with the most improvement was students demonstrating proficiency in math. In 2023, 90% of students were proficient in math compared with 81% of students in 2022. The new FAST assessment used BEST standards, which allowed teachers to utilize progress monitoring and provide remediation for students demonstrating a need.

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

One area of concern is absenteeism greater than 10%. 48 students (roughly 15% of the student population) missed more than 10% or more days. Out of those 48 students, 25 are in 8th grade. Another area of concern is students with multiple indicators; 35 of 58 students with multiple indicators are in 8th grade. There is a correlation between students scoring a Level 1 on FAST ELA and attendance.

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

1) Students in the ESSA group Students with Disabilities making learning gains on FAST ELA
2) Students demonstrating proficiency on FAST ELA
3) Students in the lowest 25% demonstrating learning gains on FAST ELA
4) Lowering the number of students with attendance below 90%
5) Students in the ESSA group Students with Disabilities demonstrating proficiency in Science

**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.

There will be a 5% increase in ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities to achieve learning gains on PM3 of FAST Reading. Students with Disabilities struggle to demonstrate proficiency in ELA, with 18% in 2022 on FSA ELA and 12% on FAST Reading. In 2022, 25% of Students with Disabilities achieve learning gains on on FSA ELA and 21% in 2023 on FAST Reading.

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

There will be a 5% increase in Students with Disabilities achieving learning gains by PM3 of 2024.

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

Student growth between PM1-PM3, Achieve3000, and classroom assessments will help track student growth.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Katie Hunt (katie.hunt@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.)

Focus on comprehension strategies using Lexia PowerUp Literacy which identifies skill gaps and provides personalized tracks for students, such as providing purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Evidence for ESSA, Lexia has a strong rating for blending student-driven explicit instruction with teacher-delivered activities.

**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 Level 1 students and those demonstrating a need will be enrolled in a middle grades Intensive Reading course for remediation. Students with Disabilities related to reading will also receive direct instruction in reading and/or writing.

**Person Responsible:** Casey Clinch (casey.clinch@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**By When:**

All Level 2 students and those demonstrating a need will be provided with Tier II interventions provided their ELA teacher in conjunction with our Intensive Language Arts teacher. This will be continually assessed using progress monitoring.

**Person Responsible:** Casey Clinch (casey.clinch@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**By When:**

Provide ongoing opportunities for extensive practice to increase reading comprehension for both long and short reading passages with complex text, utilizing programs like Achieve3000 and Lexia PowerUp.

**Person Responsible:** Katie Hunt (katie.hunt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**By When:**

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA |
|---|

**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 2023, students demonstrating proficiency on FAST Reading is 60%, down from 67% in 2022 on FSA ELA.

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

By 2024, there will be a 5% increase of students demonstrating proficiency on FAST Reading from 60% to 65%.

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

Students will be monitoring using PM1 and PM2 as data, in addition to Achieve3000 and classroom assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Katie Hunt (katie.hunt@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.)

Build student fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, and writing across content areas.

By utilizing Achieve3000, we will implement comprehension and writing into different content areas. Achieve3000 allows for differentiation and also incorporates critical thinking strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By utilizing Achieve3000, we will implement comprehension and writing into different content areas. Achieve3000 allows for differentiation and also incorporates critical thinking strategies.

**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 2 - Moderate 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 students will use Achieve3000 to build close reading and comprehension skills through non-fiction informational text. Teachers will monitor student Lexile measures for increased text complexity and comprehension.

**Person Responsible:** Casey Clinch (casey.clinch@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**By When:**

Communicate learning goals and monitor student progress toward meeting established goals.

**Person Responsible:** Katie Hunt (katie.hunt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**By When:**

## #3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

**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.

According to EWS, 48 students (or 15% of all students) were found to be absent more than 10% of days, with 25 (22%) of those students in 8th grade. 58 students (or 18% of all students) had two or more indicators, with 35 (32%) of those students in 8th grade. 8th grade also has the highest number of students scoring a 1 in reading at 17%. Students cannot receive interventions and remediation when they are not attending school consistently.

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

By 2024, there will be a 3% reduction in the number of students found to be absent more than 10% of days, bringing the number down to 40. When absenteeism improves, there should also be an improvement in reading scores.

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

Students displaying a pattern of absenteeism will be brought to SWST and parents will asked to attend meetings to determine a plan to keep students in school consistently. Communication will be sent out after 5 days and meetings will be held after 10 days.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Katie Hunt (katie.hunt@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.)

Provide intensive, individualized support to students who have fallen off track and face significant challenges to success.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students who struggle to attend school on a consistent basis would benefit from a mentor teacher (ie Advisory Teacher) who is familiar to the student, with whom they can discuss barriers to attending school regularly and strategies to improve attendance.

**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 2 - Moderate 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.

Students with attendance concerns will be monitored and referred to SWST. Strategies discussed will be implemented by Advisory Teacher.

**Person Responsible:** Katie Hunt (katie.hunt@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**By When:**

CARE meetings will be held to address attendance concerns and strategies to help students consistently attend school.

**Person Responsible:** Jonathan Cooley (jonathan.cooley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**By When:**

## 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).

Instructional time for students receiving intensive instruction will be increased, allowing for smaller groups used for students with disabilities. Early interventions will be put in place to monitor students that are flagged for absenteeism and/or struggling assessment scores. School leadership will take on more responsibilities with developing strategies for struggling students and communicating those strategies with families. There will be supplemental programs that are purchased that allow for differentiation in science, especially for students struggling with reading.