
Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 0 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

North Port High School

6400 W PRICE BLVD, North Port, FL 34291

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/northporthigh

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.

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, 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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Fusco, Shannon | Principal | Oversight of the school, students, and leadership team |
| Copeland, Linda | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal over Curriculum. Oversight of all curriculum and PD. Directly supervises Social Studies and Reading |
| PELOPIDA, AGNES | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of Administration Directly supervises Arts and Foreign Languages |
| Appolloni, Courtney | Assistant Principal | Supervisor of Math |
| Corso, Ron | Assistant Principal | Supervisor of CTE |
| Parziale, Stephanie | Assistant Principal | Supervisor of Science |
| Behringer, Luke | Assistant Principal | Supervisor of ESE |
| Backo, Autumn | Teacher, K-12 | ELA teacher and ELA Department Chair |
| Caracciolo, Teresa | Teacher, K-12 | Science teacher and Science Department Chair |
| Pinna, Dennis | Teacher, K-12 | Social Studies teacher and Social Studies Department Chair |
| Thomas, Lee | School Counselor | Counseling Department Chair |
| O'Gorman, Victoria | Teacher, K-12 | ESE Liaison and ESE Department Chair |
| Rhoten, Nancy | Teacher, K-12 | CTE teacher and CTE Department Chair |
| Hunt, Chrystal | Teacher, K-12 | Math teacher and Math Department Chair |

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 department representatives and administration review data and formulate goals to improve learning outcomes for all. Team review data and focus on tier 2 interventions in the classroom with a focus on these interventions for the school-wide PD plan, lesson plan template, and team planning notes.

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 school improvement plan will be monitored through various means including but not limited to: observational notes from administrators overseeing the content area, benchmark data, formative and summative assessments reviewed during PLT times, lesson plans, and team planning sheets. We will revise the plan based on formative and summative data and utilize support staff (behavior interventionists, liaisons, etc.) to assist teachers with goal setting both academically and behaviorally.

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 PK, 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 38% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 62% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | N/A |
| 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: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 | 593 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 104 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 |

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* | 49 | 58 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 51 | 58 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 51 | | | 55 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 36 | | | 40 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 37 | 49 | 38 | 48 | 43 | 38 | 44 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 52 | | | 34 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 52 | | | 27 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 60 | 73 | 64 | 64 | 56 | 40 | 62 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 68 | 75 | 66 | 70 | 50 | 48 | 69 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 45 | 44 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 88 | 89 | 89 | 91 | 71 | 61 | 95 | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 79 | 74 | 65 | 81 | 74 | 67 | 77 | | |
| ELP Progress | 70 | 55 | 45 | 52 | | | 47 | | |

* 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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 64 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 451 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Percent Tested | 96 |
| Graduation Rate | 88 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 59 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 652 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | 91 |

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 | 33 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | 52 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 75 | | | |
| BLK | 52 | | | |
| HSP | 62 | | | |
| MUL | 66 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | | | |
| FRL | 61 | | | |

| 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 | 41 | | | |
| ELL | 49 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 74 | | | |
| BLK | 55 | | | |
| HSP | 57 | | | |
| MUL | 60 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | | | |
| FRL | 56 | | | |

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 | 49 | | | 37 | | | 60 | 68 | | 88 | 79 | 70 |
| SWD | 16 | | | 14 | | | 21 | 29 | | 36 | 6 | |
| ELL | 28 | | | 32 | | | 45 | 53 | | 58 | 7 | 70 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 60 | | | 82 | | | 82 | | | | 3 | |
| BLK | 41 | | | 24 | | | 40 | 50 | | 69 | 6 | |
| HSP | 47 | | | 31 | | | 54 | 68 | | 79 | 7 | 67 |
| MUL | 49 | | | 33 | | | 69 | 72 | | 80 | 6 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | | | 41 | | | 63 | 70 | | 81 | 7 | 73 |
| FRL | 45 | | | 34 | | | 57 | 64 | | 79 | 7 | 66 |

| 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 | 55 | 51 | 36 | 48 | 52 | 52 | 64 | 70 | | 91 | 81 | 52 |
| SWD | 17 | 29 | 28 | 27 | 39 | 43 | 45 | 51 | | 82 | 47 | |
| ELL | 25 | 46 | 41 | 30 | 45 | 47 | 40 | 47 | | 93 | 77 | 52 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 67 | 57 | | 77 | 50 | | 83 | 80 | | 91 | 90 | |
| BLK | 46 | 44 | 30 | 42 | 56 | 48 | 57 | 50 | | 88 | 71 | 70 |
| HSP | 53 | 55 | 42 | 44 | 54 | 56 | 56 | 58 | | 88 | 77 | 48 |
| MUL | 49 | 53 | 47 | 49 | 57 | 64 | 50 | 66 | | 93 | 70 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 51 | 32 | 49 | 50 | 49 | 69 | 79 | | 92 | 84 | 37 |
| FRL | 48 | 48 | 37 | 44 | 53 | 52 | 60 | 62 | | 88 | 78 | 51 |

| 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 | 58 | 55 | 40 | 44 | 34 | 27 | 62 | 69 | | 95 | 77 | 47 |
| SWD | 15 | 39 | 38 | 16 | 19 | 21 | 25 | 41 | | 84 | 40 | |
| ELL | 41 | 58 | 50 | 42 | 50 | 44 | 43 | 52 | | 100 | 56 | 47 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 50 |
| MUL | 46 | 48 | 50 | 44 | 40 | | 59 | 81 | | 100 | 68 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 56 | 38 | 50 | 36 | 26 | 69 | 71 | | 95 | 81 | 33 |
| FRL | 50 | 51 | 39 | 40 | 30 | 25 | 56 | 64 | | 95 | 73 | 33 |

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 | 46% | 58% | -12% | 50% | -4% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 59% | -8% | 48% | 3% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 33% | 65% | -32% | 50% | -17% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 44% | 59% | -15% | 48% | -4% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 58% | 71% | -13% | 63% | -5% |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 64% | 72% | -8% | 63% | 1% |

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.

All content areas saw a decline from the 2022 school year to the 2023 and are below the district average. In addition to having a lack of certified teaching applicants for math, the contributing factors were the impact of a natural disaster which created a loss of instructional time and dwelling displacement among staff and students.

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

Math saw the steepest decline (students showing proficiency went from 48% to 39%) due to several long-term substitutes in Algebra and Geometry due to lack of applicants. Hurricane time loss and displaced families contributed. Students were also still dealing with the effects of the pandemic.

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.

Although above or on par with state averages, NPHS has shown a decline in all area, and, in particular, math. Factors that contributed to this are the following: loss of staff and the lack of certified teachers in assessed areas, hurricane academic time loss and displaced teachers and families. Students in these assessed areas have suffered trauma from the hurricane and pandemic.

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

Scores did not improve; however, our ESSA data shows that we are not listed as an underperforming school which is a great achievement due to our area being directly impacted by the hurricane. Significant trauma supports have been implemented to support those impacted.

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

Failures in both reading and math in 9th grade.

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

Hiring highly qualified teachers for core areas.

Increased formative data monitoring practices in the PLC and classroom implementation of timely interventions and extensions.

increasing focus on improving student learning outcomes on summative assessments

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

To ensure students have the best possible teacher NPBS has worked to ensure all assessed areas have common planning and have the opportunity to participate in school-wide PD that focuses on data-informed instruction and student growth.

Measurable Outcome:

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

NPBS English Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies scores will improve by 4%. English Language Arts from 49% to 53% of students at a level 3 or above.

Monitoring:

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

The area will be monitored through benchmark data, monthly common summative assessments and formative assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Copeland (linda.copeland@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.)

Teacher teams to support teacher efficacy. School-wide PD to support teachers working with each other to improve student outcomes including classroom observations and data-informed interventions

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collective efficacy has an effective size of 1.57 according to Hattie's research. By giving teachers PD and common planning for teams and planning, teachers can work together and feel supported.

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.

Common Planning.

Formative data used weekly and discussed at team planning times and used to guide instruction and support remediation and/or acceleration.

PD plan in place to utilize best practices to improve student learning outcomes and teams viewing each other's practice for feedback

Person Responsible: Shannon Fusco (shannon.fusco@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: May 2023

#2. 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.

To recruit and retain certified teachers. NPHS has new teachers with teacher mentors and attend monthly meetings that go over student improvement and instructional strategies. NPHS admin and teachers also attend local colleges and university job fairs to recruit teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the end of the year, retention of all teachers who have participated in the mentorship program at NPHS. See an improvement in certified teachers in all core areas.

Monitoring:

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

End of the year teacher retention. Increase of applicants for teaching positions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shannon Fusco (shannon.fusco@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.)

Working with area colleges and university to encourage college students to enter the teaching field and consider NPHS

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With the loss of teachers due to retirement or exiting the teaching professions, new teachers are needed to replenish the loss. Working with area colleges encourages a positive relationship and encourages students to enter the teaching field.

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.

Visit area colleges to recruit new teachers and work with new teachers through our extensive mentoring program

Person Responsible: Shannon Fusco (shannon.fusco@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: May 2023

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Graduation

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.

Graduation rate fell from 91% to 87%. The area of focus will be with a drop out prevention staff on site and then ref p10 and strategic focus on 9th to 12th

Measurable Outcome:

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

Improve our graduation rate to 90%

Monitoring:

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

Monthly tracking of seniors with credits and graduation assessment requirements. Project 10 to assign mentors for students in need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Copeland (linda.copeland@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.)

Timely progress monitoring and tracking students grades, courses requirements, and assessment needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By tracking and meeting with students (individually) we can offer various resources to ensure they meet graduation requirements.

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.

Monthly tracking of seniors with credits and graduation assessment requirements. Project 10 to assign mentors for students in need. A Grad Coach working with at risk seniors

Person Responsible: Linda Copeland (linda.copeland@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: May 2023

#4. 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.

To ensure students have the best possible math teachers, the school-wide PD plan will focus on teachers utilizing data-informed teaching practices and work with their planning team to identify remediation and acceleration techniques to improve learning outcomes. Math will have common planning to review this data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Math saw a significant drop from the 2022 school year to 2023. The goal is to show an minimum of 4% increase from 39% to 43% proficient.

Monitoring:

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

Benchmark data, formative and summative assessments, observational notes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Copeland (linda.copeland@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.)

Teacher teams to support teacher efficacy. School-wide PD to support teachers working with each other to improve student outcomes including classroom observations and data-informed interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collective efficacy has an effect size of 1.57 according to Hattie's research. By giving teachers Professional Development and common planning for team that centers around data, teachers can work together and use high-impact strategies to improve student learning.

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.

Common Planning.

Formative data used weekly and discussed at team planning times and used to guide instruction and support remediation and/or acceleration.

PD plan in place to utilize best practices to improve student learning outcomes and teams viewing each other's practice for feedback

Person Responsible: Courtney Appolloni (courtney.appolloni@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: May 2023

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

A positive school culture among students will result in less disciplinary actions. The goal of the team is to continue to implement positive interventions to decrease suspensions. Two behavior interventionists have been hired to support student behavioral growth.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Decrease Second Chance Agreements from 117 to 100 and Settlement Agreements from 27 to 20.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly SWST meetings and discipline meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

AGNES PELOPIDA (agnes.pelopida@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.)

Two full time behavior interventionists are in place to support at risk students. The goal is to build relationships and goal set to improve behavioral outcomes. North Port High School also implements a PBIS program that supports students and creates incentives for positive behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS and early intervention support will increase student engagement and support positive interaction among students and staff.

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.

Decrease in the number of suspensions.

Person Responsible: AGNES PELOPIDA (agnes.pelopida@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: May 2023