Venice Senior High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Venice Senior High School

1 INDIAN AVE, Venice, FL 34285

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/venicehigh

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.

Venice High School in partnership with the entire community, will empower every student to become a lifelong learner who is responsible, productive and engaged citizen within a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is achieving at his or her maximum potential in an engaging, inspiring learning environment.

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
Kerestely, Zoltan	Principal	
Shurley, Ryan	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Master Schedule, Professional Development, ELA Department, World Languages Department, PBP Department
Schmidt, Rosemary	Assistant Principal	Student Academics and Discipline Alpha M-R, ESE Department, Transportation
Gruhl, Mathew	Assistant Principal	Student Academics and Discipline Alpha A-L, History and PE Department, Attendance, Student Orientation, Parking
Tanaka, Danielle	Assistant Principal	Student Academics and Discipline Alpha P-Z, Arts Departments, Student Clubs and Organizations
Raney, Michael	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Administration, CTE and Math Departments, Safety and Security,, Facilities, Student Discipline, Athletics

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.

At the tier 1 level, our PBIS team is comprised of administration, classroom teachers, support staff, parents and students to ensure a balanced perspective and input in promoting a positive school culture

and environment through schoolwide communication the student handbook, signage and messaging around campus, the morning news and grade level assemblies. Our PBIS team creates clear expectations for all learners and helps promote positive behaviors by creating rewards for and incentives for students that exhibit positive behaviors on campus.

At the tier 2 and 3 level our Project 10 team, SWST team, and PBIS teams used schoolwide and classroom data to identify students in need of small group or individualized academic or behavioral support, plan interventions such as Check in Check out and Project 10 Mentoring, and monitor these supports for effectiveness. Our administrators, teachers, and counselors help facilitate these teams.

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))

Progress towards achieving SIP goals will regularly be monitored through benchmark assessment data review in PLCs. Adjustments in instruction will be made at the classroom level to account for the needs of specific groups of students through tier 2 and 3 interventions.

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	22%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	33%
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: 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	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	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	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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	578
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	263
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
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	373

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	2	77
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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

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	2	2
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*	64	58	50	63	60	51	62		
ELA Learning Gains				56			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			46		
Math Achievement*	70	49	38	62	43	38	67		
Math Learning Gains				46			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			54		
Science Achievement*	79	73	64	76	56	40	80		
Social Studies Achievement*	77	75	66	78	50	48	82		
Middle School Acceleration					45	44			
Graduation Rate	95	89	89	94	71	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	65	74	65	65	74	67	69		
ELP Progress	42	55	45	74			46		

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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	492
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	95

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	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	702
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	94

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	47			
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	54			
HSP	63			
MUL	74			
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	60			

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	55			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	49			
HSP	58			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	64			
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	64			70			79	77		95	65	42
SWD	28			48			46	54		26	6	
ELL	46			65			71	43			6	42
AMI												
ASN	74			80			91			88	5	
BLK	38			50						47	4	
HSP	57			65			76	63		50	7	40
MUL	74			71			81	70		52	6	

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	65			71			78	79		67	6	
FRL	54			61			70	68		49	7	27

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	63	56	47	62	46	41	76	78		94	65	74
SWD	22	44	41	33	34	30	40	45		87	36	
ELL	39	49	50	61	47	50	46	50		80	56	74
AMI												
ASN	69	54		86	50		92			100	88	
BLK				20						88	40	
HSP	57	53	47	54	43	33	62	76		88	56	73
MUL	72	73	85	56	46		68	69		97	57	
PAC												
WHT	64	56	44	63	47	44	79	79		95	66	
FRL	50	47	38	52	42	41	67	67		90	53	70

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	62	55	46	67	39	54	80	82		96	69	46
SWD	29	39	39	53	36	39	43	50		82	33	
ELL	32	60	58	57	45		38			75		46
AMI												
ASN	50	38					75					
BLK	0							42		100	36	
HSP	48	49	54	67	47	69	72	75		86	45	50
MUL	62	62	23	56	35		76	75		92	65	
PAC												
WHT	65	56	47	69	38	51	82	84		97	72	
FRL	48	44	39	61	45	59	71	71		92	61	

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	66%	58%	8%	50%	16%
09	2023 - Spring	63%	59%	4%	48%	15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	65%	7%	50%	22%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	59%	11%	48%	22%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	71%	6%	63%	14%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	76%	72%	4%	63%	13%

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.

ELA achievement showed the lowest performance of all tested areas at 65% proficiency. Based on PM1/ AP 1 data, ELA performance (49%) was lower than Math (56%) and therefore we had more students starting the year below proficiency in ELA.

Although ELA was our lowest data component, it was a 7 percent increase from Spring 2022, and a 17 percent increase from PM1 in Fall of the 2022/2023 SY. This growth can be contributed to the use of ILA classes, push in and pull out small group instruction to support non-proficient students. The use of No Red Ink helped our ELA and ILA teachers monitor student performance as they worked towards proficiency and target these interventions.

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

Social Studies showed the greatest decline of 1%. One of our US History teachers resigned in the middle of the year which in part contributed to our minor decline in this area. Another contributing factor was that our IB/AP US History students didn't realize they were taking the exam until shortly before they sat for it. To improve our students' performance in these courses, they are being notified of this requirement at the beginning of the school year.

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.

Venice High School performed higher than the state average in all tested areas.

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

Overall math achievement showed the most improvement from 62% in Spring 2022 to 71% in Spring 2023. This improvement can be contributed to carefully scheduling students in classes based on assessment data and providing continuous targeted support through targeted tier 2 interventions through push in and pull out support with instructional facilitators. The use of ALEKS helped our math teachers monitor student performance as they worked towards proficiency and target interventions.

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

N/A

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

Improve overall performance in ELA. Increase graduation rate. Increase PBIS participation among staff, students and the local community. Increase student engagement and successful completion of accelerated coursework.

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

#1. 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.

Increase participation in Schoolwide PBIS. Increasing the number of students meeting schoolwide expectations will decrease the number of students receiving 2 or more referrals and out of school suspensions.

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

Reduce the number of students receiving 2 or more referrals by 5 percent. Decrease the number of students receiving an out of school suspension by 5 percent. Maintain status as a Platinum PBIS Model School.

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

Assistant Principals will work with Behavior Specialist, Behavior Tech and PBIS coordinator to monitor student and staff participation in use of IMPACT Cards. Review district discipline data to target areas of concern and Check-in, Check-out data to support individual students in need of tier 2 interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rosemary Schmidt (rosemary.schmidt@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.)

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

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.

Communicate Tier 1 PBIS expectations to students, staff and families through presentations at schoolwide assemblies, staff meetings, and connect ed messaging.

Person Responsible: Michael Raney (michael.raney@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Hold quarterly celebrations to recognize students earning IMPACT cards, good grades and good attendance.

Person Responsible: Michael Raney (michael.raney@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: At the end of each grading period.

#2. 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.

Increase graduation rate to 96%.

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

Increase graduation rate to 96%.

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

APA, assistant principals and counselors, district project 10 team and grad coach will monitor the progress of all students in meeting graduation requirements. Students at or below a 2.0 will be assigned a project 10 mentor to monitor their weekly progress in earning grades required to bring up their GPA. Students who have not met testing requirements will be enrolled in intensive reading or receive pull-out support in math to prepare to earn concordant scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryan Shurley (ryan.shurley@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.)

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

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.

APs and counselors will meet bi-weekly to review senior progress through our project 10 notebook. At-risk students will be assigned a Project 10 mentor to meet weekly.

Person Responsible: Michael Raney (michael.raney@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Bi-weekly.

Enroll students in Intensive Reading, SAT/ACT prep and Algebra bootcamp.

Person Responsible: Ryan Shurley (ryan.shurley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing each quarter before SAT/ACT/FAST/BEST assessments.

#3. 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.

ELA performance was lower than any other tested areas. ELA proficiency is a graduation requirement and a key skill for high performance in other areas.

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

ELA proficiency will increase from 65% to 67% in SY 2024.

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

Teachers will use No Red Ink, Progress Monitoring and APM 1 and APM 2 data to monitor student progress towards demonstrating proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryan Shurley (ryan.shurley@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.)

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

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.

Teachers will use No Red Ink to create and administer common assessments aligned with course standards. They will use this assessment data in their PLCs to monitor progress and plan interventions.

Person Responsible: Deborah Therrien (deborah.therrien@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Weekly

ELA instructional facilitator will push into English and Reading classes to provide differentiated core tier 1 instruction and small group tier 2 interventions.

Person Responsible: Deborah Therrien (deborah.therrien@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Weekly

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

Increasing student engagement and successful completion of rigorous coursework will increase the number of students in each graduating class that have earned college credits and/or industry certifications. Increasing the interventions and supports assigned to students in rigorous course work.

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

The percent of students earning credit in accelerated coursework by the end of their senior year will increase from 65% to 67% in Spring of 2024.

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

Administration and the guidance department will use the district dashboard and sis reports to monitor student progression towards earning credit in accelerated courses, and target specific students who can access rigorous coursework through non-traditional pathways.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryan Shurley (ryan.shurley@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.)

Collective Teacher Efficacy will be created as a schoolwide culture that sets clear expectations for student achievement in all courses.

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

According to Hatties work collective efficacy has an effect size of 1.57. Teachers will meet in professional learning groups to discuss what what will happen when students do not learn content or if they are already excelling with the content.

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.

Identify specific pathways for all students to have acceleration opportunities.

Person Responsible: Ryan Shurley (ryan.shurley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: By January of each school year counselors should meet with student to ensure they are scheduled in rigorous course work.

The counseling team will develop pathways for acceleration course work and rigorous course for all students that will be in the program of studies and used for scheduling.

Person Responsible: Ryan Shurley (ryan.shurley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: This will be created by September of each school year.