

Sarasota County Schools

Sarasota School Of Arts/ Sciences



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Sarasota School Of Arts/Sciences

717 CENTRAL AVE, Sarasota, FL 34236

www.ssas.org

Demographics

Principal: Tara Tahmosh Newell

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2000

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Sarasota School of Arts and Sciences provides a small, intimate environment of academic excellence and enrichment, utilizing community partnerships as well as traditional and innovative teaching methods.

Provide the school's vision statement

Welcome to the Sarasota School of Arts & Sciences (SSA+S), an educational foundation built on encouragement, inclusiveness, exploration and personal growth. We believe that community begins in the classroom, where our students and their families are invited to meet new challenges, discover their potential and enjoy a positive learning experience together. At SSA+S, we seek to create a culture that promotes collaboration, individual needs, and high academic achievement.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tahmosh, Tara	Principal	
Williams, Carl	Assistant Principal	
Mapes, Mike	Guidance Counselor	
Kozlowski, Cathy	Guidance Counselor	
Plath, Georgia	Teacher, ESE	
Gannon, Kylie	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/15/2000, Tara Tahmosh Newell

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	255	251	250	0	0	0	0	756
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	16	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	27	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	9	10	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	11	17	0	0	0	0	45

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	9	14	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/25/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	250	250	254	0	0	0	0	754
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	22	37	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	32	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	25	24	0	0	0	0	66

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	10	0	0	0	0	28

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	250	250	254	0	0	0	0	754
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	22	37	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	32	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	25	24	0	0	0	0	66

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	10	0	0	0	0	28

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	76%	64%	54%	76%	63%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	58%	54%	63%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	50%	47%	47%	48%	47%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	81%	74%	58%	79%	74%	58%
Math Learning Gains	71%	66%	57%	64%	67%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	56%	51%	59%	61%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	61%	51%	77%	62%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	85%	72%	96%	78%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	75%	63%	12%	54%	21%
	2018	75%	63%	12%	52%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	75%	64%	11%	52%	23%
	2018	69%	62%	7%	51%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	78%	66%	12%	56%	22%
	2018	82%	70%	12%	58%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	77%	67%	10%	55%	22%
	2018	67%	66%	1%	52%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	79%	73%	6%	54%	25%
	2018	76%	73%	3%	54%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
08	2019	76%	65%	11%	46%	30%
	2018	79%	63%	16%	45%	34%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	73%	62%	11%	48%	25%
	2018	76%	62%	14%	50%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	85%	8%	71%	22%
2018	96%	80%	16%	71%	25%
Compare		-3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	73%	22%	61%	34%
2018	98%	77%	21%	62%	36%
Compare		-3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	69%	31%	57%	43%
2018	100%	71%	29%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	34	53	48	47	64	58	25	75	27		
ELL	46	60	40	71	60						
ASN	100	71		93	79						
BLK	55	60	41	65	57	54	41	82	58		
HSP	64	61	52	75	61	54	59	84	63		
MUL	71	68	45	79	68						
WHT	83	70	66	86	77	76	80	97	72		
FRL	64	61	48	75	66	61	62	89	64		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	32	38	29	38	52	44	47	89			
ELL	46	54	50	54	46	38					
ASN	89	74		95	79						
BLK	62	53	46	58	60	63	41	88	40		
HSP	70	62	47	74	59	51	72	96	76		
MUL	68	63	55	86	67						
WHT	80	65	46	83	66	62	82	97	66		
FRL	68	59	45	69	58	51	68	94	61		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	652
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	79
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	66
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our subgroup of Black students performed the lowest across several components, including English Language Arts, English Language Arts lowest quartile, Mathematics, and Mathematics Lowest Quartile. Black students have trended as our lowest performing students for several years. We believe that socioeconomic status contributes to their skill deficits. We will continue to identify strategies to assist them towards growth; discussion and analysis of this deficit, as well as consideration of the value of relationship-building, will lead to improvement.

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

Our subgroup ELL (English Language Learners) showed the greatest decline from prior year in the English Language Arts lowest quartile, from 50% to 40%, a ten percent decline. Our ELL subgroup is the smallest of our subgroups, so declines can be misleading due to the small sample size. Regardless, our school will continue to try to reach our ELL students in the lowest quartile, using research-based teaching strategies and interventions.

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

We have no gaps from the state or district averages. All of our groups, in all measured subjects and grade levels, including English Language Arts, Mathematics, Algebra, Geometry, Civics, and Science, outperformed the district and state averages.

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

Mathematics improved dramatically from 2018 to 2019. In sixth grade, we saw a 10% increase and in 7th grade, a 3% increase. In addition, we had a dramatic increase for

SWD (students with disabilities) and FRL (Free and Reduced lunch recipients) in mathematics, from 44% to 58% and from 51% to 61% respectively. We believe that our Title IV initiative to add ALEKS (Assessment and Learning, K-12) programming used in conjunction with READ 180 in our intensive languages arts labs led to these increases. In addition, the curriculum in the intensive labs was individualized to provide both choice and differentiation.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

All of our EWS (Early Warning System) data has improved except for students with two or more indicators.

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

1. Increased literacy skills for all subgroups.
2. Increased computation skills for all subgroups.
3. Increased progress with our black student subgroup in literacy and computation.
4. Increased progress and learning gains with our ELL student subgroup.
5. Increased innovations in our intensive language arts labs to continue our upward trends with the lowest 25% subgroup.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Literacy, including the comprehension of fiction and nonfiction texts, impacts all other subjects and learning. Students struggle with reading comprehension and feel the impact across all other curriculum areas, even mathematics, in which most standardized testing is a real world word problem. Literacy initiatives are a constant need for every subgroup. Meeting literacy goals while incorporating an interdisciplinary unit, community involvement, and a curriculum rich in arts integration maintains fidelity to our school's mission and charter, reaching and teaching the total child.

Measureable Outcome:

By the year 2021, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student groups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency as measured by the FSA ELA Exam. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups in which 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency, as measured by the FSA ELA Exam.

READ 180 SRI test scores will be used for progress monitoring three times per year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tara Tahmosh (taratahmosh@ssas.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

SSA+S literacy unit works for all students but specifically targets our subgroups of Black students and ELL students, with protagonists of color who are heroes, not victims, from Claudette Colvin to the cast of Hamilton. A comprehensive seventh grade interdisciplinary units focused upon Civil Rights. In Language Arts, this includes the Civil Writes workshop, an EdExplore SRQ exploration from FST, which is in addition to reading the biography, "Claudette Colvin." In seventh grade American History, the students will create an Abolitionist Project with an arts component, given the choices of a narrative, song, or poem. In Drama, the students will focus upon the phenomenon of the musical "Hamilton" and how it broke casting norms on Broadway.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

According to Randall & Marangell, " Innovative and creative instruction using texts that are more unexpected may be one way to keep things alive. ...one that is shaped and supported by art - before diving into textbooks and other challenging sources." Using this source, focus should be upon content area teachers teaching literacy skills via the curriculum that they are comfortable teaching; valuing their expertise and subject area, while developing lessons that use standards-based literacy techniques. "Creating a vibrant literacy culture stems from knowing and valuing how each discipline can contribute to a student's overall development," (Randall & Marangell, 12). To foster the most growth, our school's charter focuses upon the benefits of an interdisciplinary, liberal arts education for our middle schoolers. "Changing the Narrative; Literacy as sustaining practice in every classroom." AMLE, April 2018).

Action Steps to Implement

ELA - Biography Book Study of Claudette Colvin (7 days)

Person Responsible Dannette Craft (dannettecraft@ssas.org)

ELA - Civil Writes FST Workshop (3 days) culminating in writing a short play in small groups. the Civil Rights movement - from Abolitionists to Today.

Person Responsible Dannette Craft (dannettecraft@ssas.org)

SS - American History study of Abolitionists and the first Civil Rights movements in the US

Person Responsible Kylie Gannon (kyliegannon@ssas.org)

Drama - Hamilton Unit including casting, playwriting, and rap in theatre challenging Broadway's norms to create a phenom.

Person Responsible Tara Tahmosh (taratahmosh@ssas.org)

TV Production - Videography of the civil rights movement, from Abolitionists to Today.

Person Responsible Tara Tahmosh (taratahmosh@ssas.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Mathematics Initiatives</p> <p>Rationale</p> <p>Individualized math instruction software programs effectively reach each child's needs in a high-tech, targeted fashion, incorporating differentiation and melding it with literacy initiatives. Students who fall behind are constantly trying to catch up to their peers, in spite of constant growth and learning gains.</p>
Measureable Outcome:	<p>By the year 2021, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain, as measured by the FSA Mathematics Exam.</p> <p>By the year 2021, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile, as measured by the FSA Mathematics Exam.</p> <p>ALEKS assessments will be used for progress monitoring four times per year.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carl Williams (carlwilliams@ssas.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Math interventions for struggling students (at least two days a week) as part of their reading intervention period. This includes small group instruction and the individualized learning provided by ALEKS (Assessment and Learning, K-12). This program tailors learning to each student's needs and deficits, then assesses and instructs, per each child's level and need.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>According to Bucci and Mcewan, "The Algebra Project founded by civil rights leader Robert Moses helps students see language as a way to access mathematics. The AP is based on a five-step process. The five-step process works beautifully to provide equitable access to exploration, verbalization, and connection." This research supports the integration of mathematics and literacy intervention interwoven. Using this model, our additional reading laboratory course has changed to an integrated reading and mathematics lab, for those students reading and computing below level. This smaller environment, with individualized goals and assignments, focuses upon personal growth.</p> <p>(Bucci, Terri & Mcewan, Lee. " Weaving Math and Language Arts Literacy." AMLE, January 2015.)</p>

Action Steps to Implement

ALEKS license for every student performing at a level 1 or 2.

Person Responsible Kylie Gannon (kyliegannon@ssas.org)

ALEKS training and development data usage for two reading lab teachers.

Person Responsible Kylie Gannon (kyliegannon@ssas.org)

Small group instruction in mathematics concepts.

Person Responsible Kylie Gannon (kyliegannon@ssas.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Middle School Advisory Transition Program
The move to middle school can be difficult. The move to middle school online, in person, or hybrid, during a pandemic has increased the difficulty of the transition. Learning the ins and outs of class change, lockers, homework, as well as the demands of puberty and social skills can be added stressors for our students.

Measureable Outcome:

Given the Advisory program:
- Sixth grade student retention rate from SY 2019/20 to 2020/21 will increase by 2%.
- Student incidents of suspensions will decrease by 2% from SY 2019/20 to SY 2020/21.

Progress monitoring of retention statistics will occur at monthly board meetings when reviewing enrollment.

Progress monitoring of suspensions will occur at monthly threat assessment team meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carl Williams (carlwilliams@ssas.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Creating an interdisciplinary unit, in conjunction with the Naviance Program and College and Career Education classes taught with the counseling department, for all sixth grade students. Within their health and wellness wheel classes throughout the quarter, sixth grade students will take learning inventories, participate in character lessons, hear guest speakers, and complete activities in core classes to assist in their transition to middle school. Within their core classes, we will expand this unit, throughout the year, in all grade level core classes, when applicable, using Naviance lessons. The goal is to increase the comfort level and success of every student, with whole group interventions, based upon anecdotal and parental input, as well as teacher observation difficult period of their lives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In a wide range of studies, many social and emotional skills, sometimes called noncognitive attributes "are shown to have a direct positive relationship to students' concurrent school performance as well as future academic outcomes" (Farrington et al 2012, p.4). Studies have indicated that applying a comprehensive SEL framework can help improve test scores (Durlak, et al, 2011), increase motivation, and perserverance (Farrington et al 2012) and decrease anxiety, depression, and stress (Brackett & Rivers, 2012). In addition, SEL programs have been linked to reduced vilence and bullying (Ragozzino & O'Brien, 2009) AMLE, Middle School Journal, May 2018. Brackett, MA & Rivers, SE (2012). Transforming students' lives with social emotional learning.
Farrington, CA, et al (2012) Teaching adolescents to become learners: The role of noncognitive factors in shaping school performance.
Ragozzino, K. & O'Brian Social and Emotional Learning and bullying prevention.

Action Steps to Implement

The SSA+S Community Program (a middle school transition program).

Person Responsible Sarah Shepherd (sarahshepherd@ssas.org)

Forming Good Habits

Person Responsible Sarah Shepherd (sarahshepherd@ssas.org)

Making Friends, Tolerance, and Conflict Resolution

Person Responsible Sarah Shepherd (sarahshepherd@ssas.org)

Online Tools and How to Use Them.

Person Responsible Sarah Shepherd (sarahshepherd@ssas.org)

Naviance College and Career Readiness Tools

Person Responsible Cathy Kozlowski (cathykozlowski@ssas.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Literacy initiatives are a constant need for every subgroup. Meeting literacy goals through the content areas is an effective strategy to reach all students with literacy methods.

Measureable Outcome: By the year 2021, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all students when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency, as measured by the FSA ELA Exam. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups in which 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency, as measured by the FSA ELA Exam.

READ 180 SRI test scores will be used for progress monitoring three times per year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kylie Gannon (kyliegannon@ssas.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Topics will include planning for more reading and writing opportunities via utilizing more primary source documents, non-fiction articles, and data analysis/lab reports. Teachers will leave the training with several different strategies, resources, and products to increase the amount and frequency of literacy instruction in their classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Christopher Lewis from Core Connections, LLC will provide three days of professional development focused upon cross-curricular literacy infusion in science and social studies.

Action Steps to Implement

Modeling lessons in all science and social studies classrooms, across three school days.

Person Responsible Kylie Gannon (kyliegannon@ssas.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

At SSA+S we pride ourselves in building positive relationships with parents, families and community stakeholders to fulfill our school’s mission and goals while supporting the needs of all of our students.

This year we plan to utilize technology as much as possible to communicate with parents on their student’s academic progress and important need to know information. Our administration makes sure that all parents are signed up for grade portal so that teachers can send parents weekly updates on their student’s academic progress. Parents and students can log-in at their convenience to check current grades, missing assignments, attendance, and communicate with teachers about any concerns they have. Automated emails and phone calls are sent out to communicate with families about important upcoming dates, special events, and vital information about daily procedures that help our school run smoothly. Any correspondence made through the school is always translated for our Spanish speaking families. It is also our school’s policy to ensure that staff members respond to parent phone calls and email within 24 hours. In addition, our school has a Parent Teacher Student Society (PTSS) . This group meets quarterly with focused agendas.

In addition, in compliance with state law, Senate Bill 1546, our school has a Parent Involvement Representative to assist with any questions or concerns that families may have. Our parent involvement representative is Kylie Gannon, Assistant Principal.

Counselors give a needs assessments survey to all students and staff members in the fall to assess the needs and concerns of the student population. This helps to decipher what group topics, lessons, and presentation, will be needed in the curriculum for the school year. School wide presentations are presented by local agencies including, ALSO Youth, SPARCC,

MADD, the Holocaust Museum, Planned Parenthood, the Sarasota Health Department, and the Sheriff’s department.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$12,423.00
----------	---------------	--	--------------------

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	3390		0083 - Sarasota Schl Of Arts/Sciences	Other		\$12,423.00	
<i>Notes: READ 180 Software and Textbooks</i>							
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math					\$159,511.60
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	3490		0083 - Sarasota Schl Of Arts/Sciences	Other		\$2,397.60	
<i>Notes: ALEKS Math Software</i>							
	3390		0083 - Sarasota Schl Of Arts/Sciences	Other		\$157,114.00	
<i>Notes: Reading and Math Resource Instructional Staff Members (2)</i>							
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems					\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA					\$3,450.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	3390		0083 - Sarasota Schl Of Arts/Sciences	Title II		\$3,450.00	
<i>Notes: Core Connections - Chris Lewis - Trainer</i>							
Total:						\$178,084.60	