

Sarasota County Schools

Sarasota High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

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	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	26
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Sarasota High School

2155 BAHIA VISTA ST, Sarasota, FL 34239

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/sarasotahigh

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.

Sarasota High School will be a premier educational institution, source of pride and innovation in our community, and the cornerstone of emerging economic opportunities - producing a 21st century workforce in an ever changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sarasota High School, through shared responsibility with parents and families, graduates every student prepared for higher learning and careers to empower them as knowledgeable and engaged citizens, innovators, and life-long learners.

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
Gallof, Lindsay	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum - oversee the English and Intensive Language Arts Department, as well as school wide professional development.
Livingston, Robin	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Administration - oversee operations and PLC
Jackson, Jason	Assistant Principal	Oversee the Science and PE/ROTC Departments
Pietranton, Alana	Assistant Principal	Oversee the Social Studies Department
Donovan, Sean	Assistant Principal	Oversee Exceptions Student Education and the Math Department
Hultgren, Holly	Assistant Principal	Oversee Career and Technical Education and College and Career Readiness
Perkins, Robert	Dropout Prevention Coordinator	Dropout prevention Department Chair
Volz, Ed	ELL Compliance Specialist	ESOL Liaison
Barresi, Gina	Teacher, K-12	English Department Chair
Harshman, Andy	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Kaplan, Deb	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair
Budd, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	Career and Technical Education Department Chair
Gibbens, Kim	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Rupprecht, Mark	Teacher, ESE	ESE Liaison

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.

Administration and teacher leaders will develop a working version of the SIP, and then seek input from School Advisory Council for additional during August SAC meeting. In collaboration with all stakeholders,

will review school wide data, analyze data, develop an action plan, and monitor progress quarterly. Regular meetings are focused on continuous improvement and opportunities are built for input and feedback on goals and action steps.

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))

Regular meetings are focused on continuous improvement and opportunities are built for input and feedback on goals and action steps. Progress monitoring - data and goals will be review regularly and monitored throughout the year. Edits will be made as needed. We will keep a special focus on our targeted goals student populations to ensure they are making progress on grade level standards and benchmarks.

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 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	43%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	47%
Charter School	No
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: 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	

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	0	0	0	856	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	237	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	304	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	
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	0	0	0	648

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	130
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	

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	

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*	53	58	50	54	60	51	61		
ELA Learning Gains				43			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			35		
Math Achievement*	37	49	38	54	43	38	53		
Math Learning Gains				46			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36			35		
Science Achievement*	77	73	64	66	56	40	76		
Social Studies Achievement*	78	75	66	78	50	48	69		
Middle School Acceleration					45	44			
Graduation Rate	86	89	89	89	71	61	92		
College and Career Acceleration	78	74	65	82	74	67	83		
ELP Progress	49	55	45	45			59		

** 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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	94
Graduation Rate	86

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	627
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	89

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	39	Yes	2	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	44			
HSP	58			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	56			

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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	63			
BLK	44			
HSP	51			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	50			

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	53			37			77	78		86	78	49
SWD	20			14			42	42		43	6	
ELL	31			28			63	52		72	7	49
AMI												
ASN	61			50			76	73		80	6	
BLK	31			19			69	48		41	6	
HSP	42			31			70	67		68	7	47
MUL	49			32			68	87		74	6	
PAC												
WHT	61			46			81	85		84	6	
FRL	40			30			67	68		67	7	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	54	43	34	54	46	36	66	78		89	82	45
SWD	19	36	33	34	41	30	35	38		75	52	
ELL	30	43	44	40	47	41	47	61		92	73	45
AMI												
ASN	41	36		45			62			100	93	
BLK	27	35	37	31	39	40	30	57		76	65	
HSP	42	42	37	42	39	28	54	69		87	78	41
MUL	49	35	20	59	59		62	92		93	79	
PAC												
WHT	64	45	30	63	50	43	75	85		91	85	
FRL	38	37	33	46	36	28	55	68		83	75	50

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	61	50	35	53	32	35	76	69		92	83	59
SWD	22	33	29	35	31	26	39	47		76	42	
ELL	28	40	34	26	35	30	45	32		87	73	59
AMI												
ASN	74	58						82		100	100	
BLK	41	42	46	39	34	26	46	52		89	54	
HSP	45	40	27	33	29	30	64	52		89	73	58
MUL	56	52	42	60	45	60	83	70		96	78	
PAC												
WHT	69	55	39	64	31	38	83	80		93	90	
FRL	47	42	33	40	32	32	61	61		88	72	60

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	58%	58%	0%	50%	8%
09	2023 - Spring	48%	59%	-11%	48%	0%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	24%	65%	-41%	50%	-26%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	52%	59%	-7%	48%	4%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	71%	4%	63%	12%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	72%	5%	63%	14%

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.

Math Achievement reported at 42% proficiency. Contributing factors are low performance of Algebra 1 EOC. 61% of students who took the Algebra 1 EOC scored a level 1 (24% proficiency) The elimination of Algebra 1A and 1B required all incoming students be placed Algebra 1 to be assessed as 9th graders. Progress monitoring/benchmark data was above district average for PM1 and PM2 - interventions were aligned to assessment results but did not translate to PM3/EOC.

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

Math Achievement reported at 42% proficiency. Contributing factors are low performance of Algebra 1 EOC. 61% of students who took the Algebra 1 EOC scored a level 1 (24% proficiency) The elimination of Algebra 1A and 1B required all incoming students be placed Algebra 1 to be assessed as 9th graders. Progress monitoring/benchmark data was above district average for PM1 and PM2 - interventions were aligned to assessment results but did not translate to PM3/EOC.

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.

Math Achievement reported at 42% proficiency. Contributing factors are low performance of Algebra 1 EOC. 61% of students who took the Algebra 1 EOC scored a level 1 (24% proficiency) The elimination of Algebra 1A and 1B required all incoming students be placed Algebra 1 to be assessed as 9th graders. Progress monitoring/benchmark data was above district average for PM1 and PM2 - interventions were aligned to assessment results but did not translate to PM3/EOC.

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

The data reported during to 2022 Biology EOC had declined from the previous year (2021) -11 %. 2021 Biology EOC 76% proficiency/2022 Biology proficiency 65%/2023 Biology EOC 76% proficiency During the 2022-2023 SY the Biology PLC focused on common formative assessment. Reteach and providing interventions based on the data from Penda online resource. PLC Biology planning days were provided through JumpStart, where Biology teachers met quarterly during the school day to develop targeted interventions based on the data. +11% increase in proficiency.

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

The data reported that 191 (30%) students earned a level 1 on the grade 9 FAST assessment, with 48% proficiency reported. To break it down even further 60% of SWD scored a level 1 on the grade 9 FAST, with 14% proficiency overall SWD.

The data reported 61% of students scored level 1 on the Algebra 1 EOC, with 24% proficiency which is down from 44% during the 2022 school year. -20% decrease.

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

Highest priorities include:

Increasing overall Math proficiency by increasing the Algebra 1 EOC pass rate (24%)

Increasing overall ELA proficiency for SWD on FAST 9 and FAST 10 (14%)

Increase overall average daily attendance, 898 students below 90% attendance which is nearly 35% of population

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 Professional Learning Communities**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.

The need for a professional learning community implementation is identified as a critical need to support the growth required in our core academic areas, especially ELA and Math. As a school staff, including instructional and administrative members, the focus on developing a collaborative team-based structure that uses student performance data gathered from formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practices is critical to improving student learning and achievement. The professional learning community collaborative team model will improve the ability to properly identify students that need Tier 2 supports in order to achieve standards-based proficiency and beyond. This is especially for our student subgroups, including SWD students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The Sarasota High School staff will participate in a schoolwide professional development focused on building the collaborative team culture needed for effective professional learning communities. Staff will meet six times per year for the book study. Additionally, staff teams developed based upon common instructional assignments, will meet weekly to address the PLC four key questions.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through PLC leaders and the school administrative team. PLC leaders are required to record and share the outcomes/plans/actions of their collaborative teams. Through participation in collaborative team meetings and the monitoring of formative assessments, benchmarks, and instructional practices, administrators monitor the work of the collaborative teams for desired outcomes of data informed instruction, remediation, and enrichment. Quarterly PLC planning days will be scheduled to analyze data, create common assessments, and progress monitor benchmark data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lindsay Gallof (lindsay.gallof@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.)

1. Form a highly effective guiding coalition. Meet a minimum of once a month.
2. Engage in high levels of learning by participating in professional development.
3. Book Studies - Learning by Doing Focused Session offered quarterly.
4. Guided Data and Intervention chat during PLC

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based upon the trainings and work of PLC at Work, these strategies were selected in order to improve upon existing collaborative practices taking place on campus. The structures and adoption of the processes of the PLC at Work model, leads to the develop a staff that focuses on learning, is a collaborative culture by design, and is a results-oriented learning community. The resources and plan to incorporate professional learning through the book study method is grounded in meeting the needs of professional learners that honors their professional knowledge, supports collegiality, and expands individual and collective knowledge.

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.

Reform the Guiding Coalition to include pivotal instructional staff members that are able to plan and present the PLC at Work process to the entire staff.

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

By When: August 2023

Implement PLC meeting schedules within like content areas to support the collaborative work of addressing the four key questions of PLC at Work

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

By When: August 2023

Organize and implement professional development to foster the development of a school wide culture that invests and implements a high-functioning PLC process across all content areas.

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

By When: August 2023 - ongoing

#2. 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.

Attendance rates are directly related to student academic achievement and performance. Our prior year's data revealed a significant increase in the percentage of our student population that had attendance below 90%, especially for our 9th and 10th grade students. In the 2020-21 school year, 238 students were identified as falling below 90% attendance. The 2021-22 school year, this data point increased to 856 students, which was 33% of our student population. Additionally, by the 2022-23 school year the data point had increased again to 898 students, which was nearly 35% of our student population.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the 2023-24 school year, our percentage of students with attendance below 90% will decrease to less than 10% of our student population.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance monitoring will be done weekly by school administration. Attendance reports from our SIS will be used to identify attendance concerns.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Livingston (robin.livingston@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.)

Staff will be reminded to call home after 3 consecutive days absent without prior notice. Bi-monthly consecutive absence report will be analyzed for Chronic Absenteeism during SWST to determine if a home visit is warranted if no contact is made by alpha administrator. Our school based PBIS team will hold monthly recognitions for our students that have excellent attendance determined by our PBIS Team, as well as recognition of students who have improved their attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It is important to create a culture that encourages student attendance. Parental involvement and engagement is especially critical to meet our goals, especially for our 9th and 10th grade students. By connecting parents, teachers, and administrators in the common goal of improved attendance, academic performance and achievement will improve.

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.

Weekly monitoring of school wide attendance patterns to identify multiple absences, tardies. Direct communication with parents will be made to emphasize the importance of attendance and being present in class.

Person Responsible: Robin Livingston (robin.livingston@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Weekly - Tuesday for SWST/CARE

Contacting parents regarding chronic absence concerns via letter. The letter includes state statute information that explains the connection between student attendance and driving privileges.

Person Responsible: Robin Livingston (robin.livingston@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly beginning in August 2023

Organization of monthly attendance recognition events to celebrate the positive attendance patterns of students.

Person Responsible: Robin Livingston (robin.livingston@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing Monthly

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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 2022-2023 school year, SWD ELA proficiency decreased by, 14 % Grade 9 FAST proficiency and 14% Grade 10 FAST proficiency. Scores have decreased over the past few school years. ELA SWD Proficiency 2020-2021 (22%), 2021-2022 (19%), 2022-2023 (14%). We will meet with instructional staff and review the assessment data to determine areas of instructional improvement, interventions and content/skill weakness.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the year 2023-24, 41% of SWD taking the Grade 9 and Grade 10 FAST will demonstrate proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring of the progress toward the goal consists of administrative walk-throughs and participation in data analysis meetings after each benchmark assessment administered by the district.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lindsay Gallof (lindsay.gallof@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.)

Teachers will participate in PLC collaborative planning teams focused on developing remediation plans based on student data from teacher created common formative assessments and benchmark results. This is based on best practices and allows time to collaborate, design, and refine highly effective lessons focused on mastery of standards and tiered interventions for students. The following assessment tools will be utilized by ELA/Intensive Language Arts teachers and administrators in PLC meetings, department meetings, and in individualized coaching sessions: Benchmark FAST PM1, PM2 and PM3 assessments, IXL, Achieve3000, Progress monitoring data using IFG implementation, and PLC notes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SHS ELA/Intensive Language Arts teachers will collaborate with the Sarasota County District Curriculum Specialist to provide specific and targeted PD in the areas of data analysis and development of interventions and remediation plans. A focus on best practices and SHS ELA/Intensive Language Arts teachers will collaborate with the Sarasota County District Curriculum Specialist to provide specific and targeted PD in the areas of data analysis and development of interventions and remediation plans. A focus on best practices and Instructional strategies to support learners in the mastery of course standards. Through collaboration, teachers will engage in developing and implementing effective instructional strategies and plans for remediation. Teachers will use data to develop remediation plans to address the learning needs and content gaps of students.

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.

Participate in weekly PLC meetings with like-content teachers to analyze student work, reflect on progress monitoring data, and make instructional decisions as a professional collaborative team.

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

By When: Weekly

Analysis of ELA/Intensive Language Arts assessment data to identify skill or content deficiencies in order to develop an academic plan to meet the needs of the learner.

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

By When: Monthly

Deliberate scheduling of students into courses and with teachers to provide interventions for addressing academic needs of students.

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

By When: August - changes as needed based on data

Collaboration with ESE Liaisons, case managers to monitor student progress and attendance.

Person Responsible: Sean Donovan (sean.donovan@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Use of progress monitoring through ESE case managers for SWD students to provide academic supports.

Person Responsible: Sean Donovan (sean.donovan@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: 4.5 weeks during progress reports

#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.

In the 2022-23 school year, overall math proficiency decreased by 12% 54% to 42%. Algebra 1 EOC scores are the largest contributing factor to the decline. Algebra EOC scores decreased by 20% (44% to 24%). 61% of the students who took the Algebra 1 EOC scored a level 1. We will meet with instructional staff and review Algebra 1 assessment data and reporting category data to determine areas of instructional improvement and content weakness for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the year 2023-24, 55% of students taking the Algebra 1 End-of-Course Exam will demonstrate proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring of the progress toward the goal consists of administrative walk-throughs and participation in data analysis meetings after each benchmark assessment administered by the district.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sean Donovan (sean.donovan@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.)

Teachers will participate in PLC collaborative planning teams focused on developing remediation plans based on student data from teacher created common formative assessments and benchmark results. This is based on best practices and allows time to collaborate, design, and refine highly effective lessons focused on mastery of standards and tiered interventions for students. The following assessment tools will be utilized by

Algebra 1 teachers and administrators in PLC meetings, department meetings, and in individualized coaching sessions: Benchmark assessments, Progress Learning, Aleks Data, Progress monitoring data using IFG implementation, and PLC notes. Students who have consistency performed at a level 1 in math will be placed in a Foundation to Math course to accompany Algebra 1 and Geometry.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SHS Algebra 1 teachers will collaborate with the Sarasota County District Curriculum Specialist to provide specific and targeted PD in the areas of data analysis and development of interventions and remediation plans. A focus on best practices and instructional strategies to support learners in the mastery of course standards. Through collaboration, teachers will engage in developing and implementing effective instructional strategies and plans for remediation. Teachers will use data to develop remediation plans to address the learning needs and content gaps of students.

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.

Participate in weekly PLC meetings with like-content teachers to analyze student work, reflect on progress monitoring data, and make instructional decisions as a professional collaborative team.

Person Responsible: Sean Donovan (sean.donovan@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Algebra 1 and Geometry staff members will participate in professional development days to collaboratively plan, develop, and review students' assessment data. Days will be scheduled once a quarter by PLC group.

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

By When: Once a quarter

Algebra 1, Geometry, and Foundation of Math teacher will engage in professional development in ALEKS program implementation for interventions and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Sean Donovan (sean.donovan@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: September 2023

#5. Graduation 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.

For the 2022-23 school year we saw a decrease of 2% in the overall graduation rate from the prior year. The SWD subgroup had a grad rate of 76% for a decrease of 1% and the Black subgroup had a grade rate of 76% for a decrease of 13%. From the data, it is clear the 2023-24 school year focus area will be on the Black and SWD subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The target graduation rate for the 2023-24 school year for the school and SWD subgroup is to regain prior year loses and achieve a level equivalent to the overall school total of 90%.

Monitoring:

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

The progresses of the subgroups will be monitored by holding weekly Project 10 meetings where each student in the subgroups is reviewed to evaluate progress toward meeting graduation requirements.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Progress monitoring will be the main strategy utilized. At the beginning of the school year, school counselors complete a graduation status check on each student. Weekly Project 10 meetings are held by the school team to monitor the progress each student is making toward completing the requirements. Students not meeting the progress necessary are evaluated for a variety of interventions to meet the area they are struggling in, and progress is continually monitored until the student meets graduation requirements.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Weekly progress monitoring allows the school-based team to reach to current data as quickly as possible. If a student is struggling in a current required course, adjustments can be made to the interventions provided to get the student back on track. Weekly monitoring also allows the team to identify negative trends early enough to intervene prior to a student falling so far behind that they cannot recover.

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.

Complete graduation checks with school counselors for each student to determine areas of concerns for students in both SWD and Black subgroups.

Person Responsible: Robin Livingston (robin.livingston@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: End of August 2023

Ensure students who have not met graduation requirements through state and district wide testing are provided interventions to help earn a concordant score. SAT/ACT prep, Intensive Reading class, JumpStart afterschool tutoring.

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

By When: August 2023

Provide bootcamps prior to ACT/SAT school day testing.

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

By When: October 2023 and February 2024

After school and Summer Edmentum (Anchor) program to allow students to retrieve credits that need to be grade forgiven and make progress towards classes they are current enrolled in.

Person Responsible: Robert Perkins (robert.perkins@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing - Summer 2024

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).

JumpStart funds will be used to acquire substitutes for to teachers participating in quarterly PLC planning days. Jumpstart funds will also be allocated for after-school interventional support for students who have been identified during PLC planning.

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