

Sarasota County Schools

Suncoast Polytechnical 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
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	22

Suncoast Polytechnical High School

4650 BENEVA RD, Sarasota, FL 34233

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/suncoastpolytechnical

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.

As the Magnet Technology School for Sarasota County, Suncoast Polytechnical High School is committed to delivering a highly personalized pathway to engaged, productive citizenship by offering the supports necessary to master rigorous academic and technical curriculum leading to a future career.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Suncoast Polytechnical High School will challenge and meet the academic needs of students by offering a world class education that recognizes the demands of technology and industry through partnerships in the community and professional 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
Turgeon, Jack	Principal	
Cline, Lisa	Teacher, ESE	
Disz, Tim	Teacher, K-12	
Ferris, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	
Henderson, Nina	Teacher, K-12	
Satterly, Becky	Assistant Principal	
Hartzell, Laura	School Counselor	
Chasteen, Casey	School Counselor	

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.

Department chairs, grade level leaders, and staff are included in the process of analyzing data to determine strategies to obtain school improvement plan goals.

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))

Department chairs, grade level leaders and staff will discuss benchmarks, monitor student achievement data, and make adjustments as needed to meet the school improvement plan goals during meetings.

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	34%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) 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	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	
	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	98	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
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	20

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	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	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*	89	58	50	87	60	51	81		
ELA Learning Gains				62			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				75			56		
Math Achievement*	80	49	38	90	43	38	78		
Math Learning Gains				59			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				72			49		
Science Achievement*	98	73	64	93	56	40	94		
Social Studies Achievement*	98	75	66	93	50	48	94		
Middle School Acceleration					45	44			
Graduation Rate	100	89	89	97	71	61	98		
College and Career Acceleration	94	74	65	94	74	67	86		
ELP Progress		55	45						

** 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	93
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	559
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	82
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	822
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	97

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	78			
ELL	92			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	93			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	94			
FRL	92			

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	92			
ELL	71			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	78			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	83			

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	89			80			98	98		100	94	
SWD	73			83							2	
ELL	90			85			100				3	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	88			77			100	97		95	6	
MUL	94			55			91				3	
PAC												
WHT	88			84			98	99		93	6	
FRL	89			72			97	98		93	6	

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	87	62	75	90	59	72	93	93		97	94	
SWD	75						100	100				
ELL	82	63		82	40		90					
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	82	52	70	86	47	70	88	96		100	87	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	89	66	79	91	62	72	95	94		96	96	
FRL	91	61	76	94	54	91	91	87		95	90	

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	81	62	56	78	31	49	94	94		98	86	
SWD	59	50		70			92					
ELL	86	64		75	50		100					
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	80	80					100					
HSP	83	61	63	73	33	50	96	94		100	82	
MUL	71	36		90	50		85					
PAC												
WHT	81	64	56	79	30	45	94	94		98	86	
FRL	81	68	70	73	33	50	95	92		100	78	

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	89%	58%	31%	50%	39%
09	2023 - Spring	92%	59%	33%	48%	44%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	65%	23%	50%	38%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	59%	25%	48%	36%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	71%	27%	63%	35%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	72%	26%	63%	35%

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.

ELL and Hispanic subgroups underperform in Math and English, but outperform their peers in social studies.

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

The largest areas for growth and improvement are in math and ELA. ELA Hispanic students fell 4% on ELA achievement. Geometry is another area for improvement.

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

The largest gap was in math assessment results by achievement level. SPHS had 46.4% level 3, where the state had 25.6%. Overall 89.8% of SPHS students were level 3 or above in math, the state only 53.1% were level 3 or above.

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

The largest area of improvement was the math learning gains lowest 25%. Our numbers increased from 49% to 72% in 21-22.

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

Our two largest areas of concern are ELA learning gains and Hispanic student data.

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

ELL and Hispanic subgroup data, ELA learning gains, and math learning gains (overall).

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

ESSA subgroup participation and achievement in AP courses needs to be improved.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ESSA subgroup participation in AP courses will increase by 2%. ESSA subgroup pass rate in AP course examinations will increase by 2%.

Monitoring:

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

AP course rosters will be monitored and examined based on ESSA subgroups. AP score reports will be broken down by ESSA subgroups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jack Turgeon (jack.turgeon@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.)

School counselors, teachers, and administration will provide information regarding AP courses to all students and encourage all students to enroll in courses when appropriate based on prior academic performance on AP courses and other summative assessments. PLC will continue to develop teachers instructional practices to improve student outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A comprehensive presentation is needed for prospective AP students. PLC initiative is a district wide opportunity to improve collaboration and instructional practice.

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.

School counselors will need to work with administration and AP staff to develop a comprehensive presentation for prospective AP students.

Person Responsible: Jack Turgeon (jack.turgeon@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: March 7th.

#2. 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.

Geometry EOC pass rates have decreased from 91% in 21-22 to 84% in 22-23. This measure is included in the school grade.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SPHS Geometry EOC pass rate will increase by 2% this year to a score of 86% of students passing with a score of 3 or higher.

Monitoring:

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

The math department chair, geometry teachers, and assigned administrator will monitor progress via district benchmarks, ALEKS data and common assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Becky Satterly (becky.satterly@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.)

The implementation of the PLC process as well as the use of ALEKS with fidelity and the use of common assessments will lead to desired gains.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Sarasota county is continuing the PLC process district wide. This process will support the data driven decisions made to support students academic growth. ALEKS data will be used to measure growth as well as gaps as they emerge. Common assessments will reveal strengths and weaknesses in each student's 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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 learning gains was static from 21-22 to 22-23. ELA learning gains is a critical measure of writing and reading ability which impact academic success across multiple subject areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA learning gains will improve from 62% in 2023 to 66% in 2023.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers, department chair and the assigned administrators will monitor the progress through FAST PM1 and PM2 in order to evaluate data from the FAST ELA assessment at the end of the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jack Turgeon (jack.turgeon@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.)

SPHS is utilizing a RTIMTSS approach. All students are receiving reading instruction that is based on data received from the FAST Progress Monitoring. Tier 2 interventions are available to students in after school tutoring. Tier 3 interventions include students being enrolled into a Critical Thinking Skills course taught by ELA teachers with an emphasis on filling learning gaps and improve achievement in writing and reading. Use district PLC initiative to build collaboration from teachers to improve instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

RTI/MTSS has been shown to provide results. Strategies are based on needs with increasing level of interventions.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education**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.

SPHS is the only magnet high school for Sarasota County. Every student has an opportunity to earn CTE certifications and/or AP coursework at SPHS.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the number of CAPE certifications earned and the SPHS school grade acceleration score by 2%.

Monitoring:

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

SPHS CTE Department Chair and administration will track certifications earned quarterly. SPHS administration and school counselors will ensure that all SPHS students are on a path to earn a certification in their CTE or earn an acceleration point by taking an AP course by the end of their 10th grade year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jack Turgeon (jack.turgeon@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.)

SPHS has deliberately aligned the master schedule to allow for all students to either earn a certification or complete an AP course by the end of their 10th grade year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SPHS provides an opportunity for all students to earn an acceleration point and a CAPE certification by ensuring that there are multiple courses available to all students during their 9th and 10th grade years.

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.

Provide opportunities for all students to earn CAPE certification and/or take an AP class as appropriate through deliberate and purposeful master scheduling.

Person Responsible: Becky Satterly (becky.satterly@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: December 2023

Encourage students to test to earn certifications when they are ready and provide multiple opportunities to earn certification.

Person Responsible: Jack Turgeon (jack.turgeon@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: May 2024

#5. 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.

Implementation of collaborative planning framework that ensures high levels of student learning through the professional learning communities model. Collaborative teams will build shared knowledge of state/essential standards, district curriculum guides, advanced placement curriculum, common assessments, formative/summative assessments, and student achievement data to help our students to reach their highest academic performance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Implementation of collaborative planning teams through their professional learning communities (PLC) model through all teachers/departments.

Monitoring:

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

PLC minutes, reports from department chairs and observations by administrators will be used to measure participation and implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Becky Satterly (becky.satterly@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.)

Grade level, department, and teachers of the same courses develop a collaborative support team that functions as a support system for potential instructional problem solving then identify areas of academic difficulty, propose and implement Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Sarasota County Schools common goals to implement a collaborative planning framework that ensures high levels of student learning by engaging in the PLC model. PLCs must have time to meet and accurate/timely data to use for decision making.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#6. 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 and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Through the use of surveys community and teacher feedback will improve from the previous years.

Monitoring:

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

SPHS school culture is built on its designation as Sarasota County's Technology Magnet High School. Our positive school culture at SPHS is built through consistent "high expectations" for our students, both academically and behaviorally. SPHS positive school culture is regularly reinforced by teachers, support staff, and administrators. Our PBIS Team provides school wide initiatives to encourage and recognize positive behaviors.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Becky Satterly (becky.satterly@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.)

PBIS team will meet and provide school wide initiatives to encourage and recognize positive behaviors. PBIS is embedded in our daily operations at SPHS. SPHS will also utilize seminar as an opportunity to support PBIS and positive culture at SPHS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increasing positive culture and PBIS at SPHS will reflect a positive learning and working environment for all students, staff, and community members/stakeholders.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No