

Sarasota County Schools

Sarasota School Of Arts/ Sciences 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	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	18

Sarasota School Of Arts/Sciences

717 CENTRAL AVE, Sarasota, FL 34236

www.ssas.org

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Sarasota 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.

Sarasota School of Arts & Sciences' (SSA+S') educational foundation is 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, 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
Tahmosh, Tara	Principal	Ensuring fidelity to the school improvement plan and goals.
Gannon, Kylie	Assistant Principal	Ensuring fidelity to the school improvement plan and goals.
Williams, Carl	Assistant Principal	Ensuring fidelity to the school improvement plan and goals, and monitoring progress toward the SIP goals.

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.

Stakeholders are involved in SIP development through our School Advisory Council, which meets on a monthly basis. Our SAC is kept abreast of our School Improvement Plan goals and progress toward these goals via a Principal's Report, a Parent Involvement Representative report, and Faculty Representative report at each of these meetings. In addition, the SAC reviews each School Improvement Plan before it is submitted to the County and State for review. As a part of this process, the school leadership team discusses the plan, addresses questions and concerns, and explains the process for plan fidelity and success before it is approved for submission by the SAC.

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 toward School Improvement Plan goals will be monitored via Read180 progress monitoring data (reading goals) and FAST formative and summertime assessment data (reading goals), and Sarasota County School Climate survey data (positive culture and environment).

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	46%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	<i>Data will be uploaded when available</i>
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2020-21: 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	29	47	56	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	26	56
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	32	26	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	12	15	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	56	54	139

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	42	52	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	27	52
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	1	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	9	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	33	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	16	21	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	33	67

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	49	44	72	165

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	44	42	52	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	27	52
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	1	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	9	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	33	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	16	21	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	33	67

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	49	44	72	165

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	70			74			76		
ELA Learning Gains	53			63			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45			49			57		
Math Achievement*	73			72			81		
Math Learning Gains	65			50			71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60			56			65		
Science Achievement*	60			64			73		
Social Studies Achievement*	91			93			93		
Middle School Acceleration	67			73			69		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	584
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	58			
HSP	58			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	60			

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)

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	70	53	45	73	65	60	60	91	67			
SWD	25	36	35	37	51	42	19	73	18			
ELL	51	49	45	58	61	58	34	83	48			
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50	48	48	47	65	69	46	88	63			
HSP	59	52	40	61	60	56	50	86	61			
MUL	88	68		85	67		87	100	67			
PAC												
WHT	76	54	45	81	67	61	64	93	71			
FRL	59	51	49	62	62	60	57	87	52			

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	74	63	49	72	50	56	64	93	73			
SWD	28	42	38	35	51	53	23	74				
ELL	65	66	46	63	43	48	61	100	73			
AMI												
ASN	100	92		83	42							
BLK	52	56	38	54	40	52	44	94	55			
HSP	67	62	51	66	46	48	51	87	65			
MUL	86	55		89	71							
PAC												
WHT	78	65	53	76	51	64	71	96	76			
FRL	63	58	43	64	46	51	52	91	71			

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	76	67	57	81	71	65	73	93	69			
SWD	34	53	48	47	64	58	25	75	27			
ELL	46	60	40	71	60							
AMI												
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							
PAC												
WHT	83	70	66	86	77	76	80	97	72			
FRL	64	61	48	75	66	61	62	89	64			

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

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.

Students with disabilities showed the lowest performance. Our focus during the previous school year was primarily upon closing the achievement gap, specifically in regards to black students, and the improvements in our learning gain scores show progress in the effort. We also believe that several additional factors, including the lingering academic and social-emotional impacts of online schooling and COVID, compounding skill deficits over many years before middle school, and lack of motivation stemming from many years of struggling before reaching middle school contribute to the lower performance in the SWD subgroup.

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

Our English Language Learners (ELLs) showed the greatest decline from the previous year. We believe this is due to a variety of factors, including the residual academic and social-emotional impacts of online learning during COVID, lack of English support and exposure in many households among this subgroup, and the number of ELL students with dual exceptionalities (i.e. ELL students who also have a learning or speech disability). In addition, we have a very all population of ELL students overall, so poor performance by one or two students has a significant statistical impact on the overall data point.

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 compared to state averages were among our 6th grade population. As a whole, our sixth grade students outperformed the state average in reading by 29 percentage points and in math by 23 percentage points. We believe that these students were so successful due to our 2023 SIP focus upon creating a positive climate and culture, specifically in regards to transitioning to middle school. Last year, we implemented a pilot Advisory program that was focused upon assisting 6th graders with transitioning to middle school, which we believe was very successful and contributed to the overall academic success of our 6th graders.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was our multiracial subgroup. Our multiracial subgroup population has increased in recent years, and we believe that that our focus upon closing the achievement gap among our black students has positively impacted this group. In addition, our focus upon climate and culture, including the focused effort we have made in regards middle and high school transition for our students has positively impacted this group.

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

Our major potential area for concern is Reading for Latino, ELL, Black, and SWD students. These students are underperforming all students by significant margins (11, 18, 20, and 45 percentage points, respectively).

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

Our highest priorities for the upcoming school year are going to be Reading instruction for our ELL, Black, and SWD students. In addition, we are going to continue our focus on positive environment and capitalize on the success of our pilot Advisory program by creating a formal Advisory (College and Career Readiness) class for incoming 6th grade students that will continue to assist them with transitioning to middle school and target specific academic and social-emotional skills that are necessary for overall success.

Area of Focus

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

:

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Literacy impacts all other areas of learning. Students who struggle with reading comprehension struggle across all content areas, including math, which has become increasingly reading and word problem based. Research shows that Project Based Learning with literacy infusion consistently outperform their peers on state science and social studies assessments, outperform peers on measures of subject area knowledge and information reading, and outperform peers on the state of of year ELA assessments (Michigan State University, University of Michigan, Stanford University). According to our school data, literacy development is a need of every subgroup, but this need is especially pronounced amount SWD. Meeting literacy goals, in ELA, Reading, and in the Content Areas and Electives, will reach students with a variety of methods and lessons, which will directly benefit and impact SWD, who often need to extra support to master literacy skills. By making literacy an area of focus throughout the school, these students will receive targeted support in all content area classes throughout the school ay.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the year 2024, there will be a minimum of four percentage points increase for all student groups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency, as measured by the FAST PM 3 ELA test. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups in which 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency, as measured by the FAST PM 3 ELA test.

Monitoring:

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

READ 180 Scholastic Reading Inventory Exams (three times per year)
PM1 and PM2 FAST Exams

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tara Tahmosh (taratahmosh@ssas.org)

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.)

All ELA, Science, and Social Studies teachers will receive Professional Development and support to plan for more reading and writing opportunities via primary sources, nonfiction text, and data analysis opportunities. A one-size fits all approach no longer prepares students for future success. Designing units and lessons that cater to multiple academic levels and using the progress monitoring state exam results will continually develop the skills of all learners and will prevent stagnation within their learning. Teachers will facilitate collaborative group work in which students will be based upon homogenous grouping to continually challenge them. Teachers will provide opportunities for choice on projects assignments, directly benefiting struggling students. Gifted and Talented students will be challenged through compacting the curriculum and have opportunities for curriculum enrichment. Teachers will use formative assessment to gain a more accurate, individualized understanding of student learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Christopher Lewis from Core Connections, LLC will provide four days of Professional Development focused on literacy strategies across content areas.

Endorsement courses and certification exams offered to all core teachers in Gifted, ESE, ESOL, and Reading.

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.

Professional Development with Core Connections on the October Professional Day with a follow up, in class, modeling lessons for two additional school days.

Person Responsible: Kylie Gannon (kyliegannon@ssas.org)

Enrolling faculty in Endorsement classes

Person Responsible: Kylie Gannon (kyliegannon@ssas.org)

PLC meetings on literary skills and strategies with SS and Science teachers, based upon PM1 and PM 2 reading scores

Person Responsible: Trevor Bliss (trevorbliss@ssas.org)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to

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.

SSA+S strives to maintain a positive school culture and environment through a variety of methods. We partner with outside agencies and organizations to proactively address common middle school issues and concerns as part of our Character and Health Education Program, and we have previously implemented an Advisory focused curriculum in our Health and PE classes. We have found this to be successful; therefore, we have decided to implement a formal Advisory period for incoming 6th grade students this school year. This class will address transitioning to middle school, social emotional development, organization, study habits, etc... We believe that SWD will significantly benefit from this class, as many SWD struggle with the middle school transition more than their non-disabled peers. We believe that by addressing the transition struggle, academic success will be positively impacted.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the year 2024, there will be a minimum of four percentage points increase for all student group when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency, as measured by FAST PM 3 data. There will be a minimum of two percentage point increase for all student groups in which 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency, as measured by the FAST ELA PM 3 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

We participate in Sarasota County Schools' annual Climate Survey for Students, Staff, and Families, and this data will be the main means of measuring the success of the positive culture and environment goals.

The overall success of Advisory classes and this goals can also be measured with FAST assessment data and the number of 6th grade students who fail a class each Quarter.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tara Tahmosh (taratahmosh@ssas.org)

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.)

We are implementing a formal Advisory program for 6th graders to provide additional support to 6th graders who are transitioning to middle school as an academic intervention. We believe that the Adviosry component and its potential impact on academic success is essential to addressing our SWD Reading goal. According to the Association for Middle Level Educators (AMLE), "In fact, advisory programs offer a host of benefits to adolescents that are struggling with adversity in their lives. While advisory programs have shown a positive effect on student attendance in general, research suggests that this effect is more pronounced with students who are academically struggling."

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We have found that transiting to middle school is difficult for all students and families, but it is especially difficult for SWD. Students who are struggling with this transition tend to be disorganized, disengaged, and struggle academically and socially. In addition, some struggle with discipline. All of these factors negatively impact learning for these students. By having a structured calls period to address some of these struggles, we believe that more students, and especially SWD will find the transition to middle school less stressful and will be overall more successful.

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.

Design and implement Advisory class for incoming 6th grade students.

Person Responsible: Tara Tahmosh (taratahmosh@ssas.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

We not not receive funding from Sarasota County School to address out School Improvement Plan goals.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$115,870.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0083 - Sarasota Schl Of Arts/Sciences	Title II		\$3,600.00
			<i>Notes: Chris Lewis from Core ELA Connections for ELA Professional Development (\$3600)</i>			
			0083 - Sarasota Schl Of Arts/Sciences	General Fund		\$82,270.00
			<i>Notes: Salary for Reading Teachers and Paraprofessionals</i>			
			0083 - Sarasota Schl Of Arts/Sciences	General Fund		\$30,000.00
			<i>Notes: Cost for Scholastic Read180 Program</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment:				\$67,152.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24

			0083 - Sarasota Schl Of Arts/Sciences	General Fund		\$61,152.00
			<i>Notes: Salary for Advisory ESE AIDE/ paraprofessionals</i>			
			0083 - Sarasota Schl Of Arts/Sciences	General Fund		\$6,000.00
			<i>Notes: Salary for Advisory Curriculum design</i>			
					Total:	\$183,022.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes