

Sarasota County Schools

Venice Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Venice Elementary School

150 MIAMI AVE E, Venice, FL 34285

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/veniceelementary

Demographics

Principal: K IR K Hutchinson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	44%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: A (63%) 2014-15: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
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

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

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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Venice Elementary School

150 MIAMI AVE E, Venice, FL 34285

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/veniceelementary

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	35%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	19%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://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.

The mission of Venice Elementary School is to develop passionate and responsible life-long learners who care for themselves, their community and their world while in pursuit of reaching their greatest potential. This will be accomplished by an exceptionally well-qualified staff actively collaborating with motivated students, involved families, and the community in a safe, supportive environment. Every child... every day... whatever it takes.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Venice Elementary School's faculty and staff are committed to providing students with exemplary instruction that nurtures curiosity, critical thinking, and a passion for learning resulting in students who are healthy individuals academically, artistically, physically, and emotionally. We will work collaboratively with all stakeholders to prepare our students for success that far surpasses high school graduation. Our vision is that every child views learning as achievable and that every staff member believes in the collective efforts of the people that serve our children so that every student has an equitable chance at success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hutchinson, Kirk	Principal	School Principal - responsible for the daily operation of the school
Christie, Lori	School Counselor	School Counselor - responsible for the SEL aspects of our school program
Hicks, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Grade 3 Instructional Team Leader
DiPillo, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Grade 1 Instructional Team Leader
Randlett, Kaitlin	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal - responsible for the daily operation of the school
Banks, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Grade 2 Instructional Team Leader
Bader, Linda	Teacher, K-12	Grade K Instructional Team Leader
Callan, Jeff	Teacher, K-12	Specials Team Instructional Team Leader
Reynolds, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	Grade 5 Instructional Team Leader
Knarr, Jessica	Administrative Support	ESE Liaison - Responsible for ESE compliance and support of the school-wide ESE program.
Olsson, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Grade 4 Instructional Team Leader
Starkey, Barbara	Teacher, ESE	ESE Instructional Team Leader

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	83	102	91	103	87	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563
Attendance below 90 percent	1	8	4	8	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

43

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	9	6	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	9	6	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	81%	68%	57%	74%	68%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	62%	58%	64%	63%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	53%	53%	50%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	84%	73%	63%	83%	72%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	67%	62%	76%	68%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	53%	51%	74%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	85%	65%	53%	73%	64%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	83 (0)	102 (0)	91 (0)	103 (0)	87 (0)	97 (0)	563 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 (8)	8 (8)	4 (9)	8 (6)	5 (9)	6 (9)	32 (49)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (2)	1 (1)	0 (1)	0 (1)	2 (2)	3 (7)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (14)	6 (17)	9 (17)	19 (48)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	79%	70%	9%	58%	21%
	2018	77%	68%	9%	57%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	67%	9%	58%	18%
	2018	78%	67%	11%	56%	22%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	85%	68%	17%	56%	29%
	2018	66%	66%	0%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	77%	73%	4%	62%	15%
	2018	72%	72%	0%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	72%	7%	64%	15%
	2018	86%	71%	15%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	91%	70%	21%	60%	31%
	2018	87%	72%	15%	61%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	85%	65%	20%	53%	32%
	2018	69%	67%	2%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	55	68	68	63	70	71	70				
ELL	50			50							
HSP	70	83		78	87	80	82				
MUL	69			75							
WHT	83	72	68	85	80	61	84				
FRL	66	68	68	75	81	72	79				

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	46	53	50	57	58	50	32				
ELL	40	36		80	55						
HSP	63	39		81	60	73					
WHT	78	66	55	82	68	60	73				
FRL	64	59	48	77	60	64	54				
2017 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	31	33	38	48	63	52	33				
ELL	50	50		63	69						
ASN				100							
HSP	63	71		70	71						
MUL	80			73							
WHT	75	61	41	85	76	74	73				
FRL	63	56	48	70	72	72	56				

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	76
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	607
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	66
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	79
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	76
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	73
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The area that demonstrated the lowest performance as reported by the 2018/2019 results is the ELA learning gain of the students in the lowest quartile. While this data component was the lowest area, the result showed an increase of 14% points from the prior year. The student groups that demonstrated the lowest overall performance are the ELA (50%) and Mathematics (50%) achievement levels of our ELL students and the ELA (55%) and mathematics (63%) achievement levels of our SWD.

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

Our 4th grade results dipped slightly in both ELA and Mathematics proficiency when compared to the prior year's 4th grade students. However, when comparing the cohort results, our math proficiency increased 7% from the prior year; our ELA proficiency decreased by 1% when comparing the cohort results.

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.

N/A - all data components exceed the state and district averages.

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

Our science proficiency results increased 17% from the prior year. During the 18/19 school year, our master schedule contained a dedicated science block, lasting anywhere from 45-60+ minutes, depending upon the grade level. We also instituted a science review program prior to the administration of the state science assessment. We also departmentalized our teaching assignments in grades 3-5.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

During the 2018-2019 school year, 40 VES students had attendance rates below 90%. This is approximately 6% of our student population. Decreasing this number will be a goal for the upcoming school year.

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

1. ELA and Mathematics learning gains of the lowest quartile
2. SWD - ELA and Mathematics Proficiency Rates
3. ELL - ELA and Mathematics Proficiency Rates
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Mathematics Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile

Rationale The percent of students in our lowest quartile for mathematics demonstrating a learning gain increased from 65% to 67% with the 2019 FSA administration.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

By the end of the 2020 school year, 71% of students in the lowest quartile will demonstrate a learning gain, as measured by the mathematics FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kirk Hutchinson (kirk.hutchinson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy

The identification, and targeted instruction, of the learning needs for the students in the lowest quartile. Instructional staff will, based upon student data, develop targeted interventions for the gaps that are present with the students who performed in our lowest quartile.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Teachers will utilize progress monitoring data, including but not limited to, iReady data (diagnostic and standards mastery), classroom assessments, student work results, and mathematics inventories, to identify student instructional gaps. Working with school and district staff, the teachers will then develop targeted interventions using resources that include, but are not limited to, iReady MAFS materials, district provided resources, and additional intervention components, to address the student instructional needs.

Action Step

Description

1. Provide 2019 FSA data to teachers.
2. Analyze FSA and AP iReady data.
3. Develop interventions to address student instructional gaps.
4. Implement interventions.
5. Review student performance on the interventions through the outcomes of iReady and classroom assessments.

Person Responsible

Kirk Hutchinson (kirk.hutchinson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2	
Title	ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile
Rationale	The percent of students in our lowest quartile for ELA demonstrating a learning gain increase from 50% to 64% with the 2019 FSA administration. This area is the lowest performing area when examining school grade components.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2020 school year, 68% of students in the lowest quartile will demonstrate a learning gain, as measured by the ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kirk Hutchinson (kirk.hutchinson@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The identification, and targeted instruction, of the learning needs for the students in the lowest quartile. Instructional staff will, based upon student data, develop targeted interventions for the gaps that are present with the students who performed in our lowest quartile.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will utilize progress monitoring data, including but not limited to, iReady data (diagnostic and standards mastery), classroom assessments, student work results, and ELA inventories, to identify student instructional gaps. Working with school and district staff, the teachers will then develop targeted interventions using resources that include, but are not limited to, iReady LAFS materials, district provided resources, and additional intervention components, to address the student instructional needs. The Striving Reader decision tree will also be utilized to accelerate student learning and address specific academic needs.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide 2019 FSA data to teachers. 2. Analyze FSA and AP iReady data. 3. Develop interventions to address student instructional gaps. 4. Implement interventions. 5. Review student performance on the interventions through the outcomes of iReady and classroom assessments.
Person Responsible	Kirk Hutchinson (kirk.hutchinson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3	
Title	ELA Proficiency Levels of ELL and SWD Students
Rationale	While the proficiency results of these student groups increased from the prior administration (ELL increased from 40 to 50%; SWD increased from 46 to 55%), they still represent the lowest performing student groups. The ELA proficiency levels of our ELL (50%) and SWD (55%) were the two lowest student group results from the 2018/2019 FSA administration.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2020 school year, 55% of ELL students and 60% of SWD students will score a level 3 or higher as measured by the 2020 FSA administration.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kirk Hutchinson (kirk.hutchinson@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	An inclusion model of instruction will be used in grades K-5, with our ESE staff providing supplemental instruction to our students, which is in addition to small group reading instruction with the classroom teacher. Furthermore, all iReady and diagnostic data will be analyzed to develop instructional strategies that support the IEP goals and the students' mastery of the grade level curriculum. Our ELL students are also fully included in our general education classrooms and work with teachers who possess their ESOL endorsement. Furthermore, the ELL paraprofessional works with our students on language acquisition skills and supports the students in their mastery of the grade level curriculum. The Striving Reader Decision Tree will also be utilized to assist in developing targeted interventions and instructional strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research demonstrates the effectiveness of inclusive instruction. In addition to receiving specially designed instruction to address academic IEP goals, the students are also presented with the grade level curriculum and provided scaffolds and supports to demonstrate mastery of this curriculum. The combination of these instructional techniques allows the students to demonstrate success on areas of need and the appropriate grade level expectations. Our ELL students will also work in their general education classrooms and access the grade level curriculum. Research demonstrates that targeted instruction and scaffolded support accelerates the acquisition of language skills and content knowledge of ELL students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will develop lessons that address the specific grade level curriculum through the identification of learning intentions and success criteria. 2. The teachers will analyze iReady and additional student data elements through formative and summative assessments. 3. Instructional approaches will be addressed and adjusted based upon student data outcomes and the learning intentions and success criteria of the upcoming lessons. 4. The Striving Reader Decision Tree will be utilized to assist in developing targeted interventions and instructional strategies. 5. ESE and ELL staff will work collaboratively with the classroom teachers to develop instructional paths that address student needs and are based upon current student data.

Person Responsible Kirk Hutchinson (kirk.hutchinson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#4	
Title	Mathematics Proficiency Levels of ELL and SWD Students
Rationale	The proficiency results of these student groups were varied when compared to the prior administration (ELL decreased from 80% to 50%; SWD increased from 57% to 63%). These two student groups represent the lowest performing student groups from the 2018/2019 FSA administration.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2020 school year, 55% of ELL students and 67% of SWD students will score a level 3 or higher as measured by the 2020 FSA administration.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kirk Hutchinson (kirk.hutchinson@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>An inclusion model of instruction will be used in grades K-5, with our ESE staff providing supplemental instruction to our students, which is in addition to small group mathematics instruction with the classroom teacher. Furthermore, all iReady and diagnostic data will be analyzed to develop instructional strategies that support the IEP goals and the students' mastery of the grade level curriculum. Our ELL students are also fully included in our general education classrooms and work with teachers who possess their ESOL endorsement. Additionally, the ELL paraprofessional works with our students on language acquisition skills and supports the students in their mastery of the grade level curriculum. The iReady Teacher Toolbox will also be utilized to assist in developing targeted interventions and instructional strategies.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Research demonstrates the effectiveness of inclusive instruction. In addition to receiving specially designed instruction to address academic IEP goals, the students are also presented with the grade level curriculum and provided scaffolds and supports to demonstrate mastery of this curriculum. The combination of these instructional techniques allows the students to demonstrate success on areas of need and the appropriate grade level expectations. Our ELL students will also work in their general education classrooms and access the grade level curriculum. Research demonstrates that targeted instruction and scaffolded support accelerates the acquisition of language skills and content knowledge of ELL students.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will develop lessons that address the specific grade level curriculum through the identification of learning intentions and success criteria. 2. The teachers will analyze iReady and additional student data elements through formative and summative assessments. 3. Instructional approaches will be addressed and adjusted based upon student data outcomes and the learning intentions and success criteria of the upcoming lessons. 4. The iReady Teacher Toolbox will be utilized to assist in developing targeted interventions and instructional strategies. 5. ESE and ELL staff will work collaboratively with the classroom teachers to develop instructional paths that address student needs and are based upon current student data.
Person Responsible	Kirk Hutchinson (kirk.hutchinson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Progress towards Schoolwide Improvement Priorities will be shared regularly with our staff and School Advisory Council.

Part IV: Title I Requirements**Additional Title I Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Venice Elementary School values the involvement of our families and community stakeholders. Our school, in conjunction with our PTO, hosts many family events that are designed to increase multi-generational family engagement. Furthermore, many of our family meetings are broadcast live to encourage the participation of those families that are not able to attend. Our family events are held at varying times throughout the year, including before, during, and after school. In addition, our staff engages in regular communication with our families to ensure that the academic, social, and emotional expectations have been clearly communicated. These communications take place in person, via the telephone, and through digital means. In addition to individual teacher communications, VES hosts a Meet Your Teacher event at the beginning of the school year, as well as an Open House approximately 15 days after the start of the year. This is yet another opportunity for our families to meet with the teacher and learn about the expectations for the school year. Our website, Facebook, Instagram, and school App also serve as methods to increase family engagement.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Through the use of a social-emotional instructional resource, our students are provided with regular instruction from our school counselor and Gifted Resource teacher to address, in a proactive manner, the development of social-emotional skills and strategies within our students. Furthermore, using the Civility Squad characteristics, we incorporate a weekly SEL segment on our morning news program. Additionally, our counselor, school psychologist, and social worker will provide counseling to students as needed. For individual students we will also assign a staff mentor as needed. Every instructional staff member at VES has participated in the Kognito At-Risk for Elementary School Educators online 2-hour training module that helps teachers identify and support the social-emotional needs of students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Students are invited to a Kindergarten Open House in the spring prior to their Kindergarten year to tour the school and to meet school staff. All preschools in the community collect data on the progress of all students as they transition into Kindergarten. These data sheets are shared with Kindergarten staff so

that our students have a smooth transition into school. Furthermore, our Kindergarten staff conducts screening assessments on all incoming K students to ascertain their BOY skills and areas for continued focus. In addition, the VES PTO offers many activities during the school year that prospective kindergarten students are invited to attend. Students leaving VES for their district school are invited to a field trip to visit Venice Middle School to learn more about the school and understand the programs VMS has to offer. Staff from our district middle school, Venice Middle, are invited to conduct meetings with all 5th grade students as well as participate in school activities such as Pow Wow and the Little Indian Run. This year we will be collaborating with Venice High School Engineering program to support our STEM fair. The administration from VES will be working collaboratively with VMS and Laurel Nokomis School (LNS) to promote their school programs and ensure a seamless transition for 5th grade students and their families.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The ESE Liaison and School Counselor work together to coordinate 504s and the MTSS/RtI Process. They meet with teachers to discuss students struggling academically or behaviorally/emotionally. Training for MTSS process is provided to all Team Leaders and grade level team members. Team Leaders act as coordinators for the teachers on their team throughout the MTSS process. All necessary paperwork for teachers is provided to the staff. The individual classroom teacher reviews and collects all completed forms, graphs, and data. School Counselor and ESE liaison schedule all school-based MTSS Team meetings. The MTSS Team meets once a week to discuss students and interventions on all tiers. Furthermore, all students receiving interventions are cross-referenced with district provided early-warning sign reports to ensure that all students who should receive interventions are identified.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Our students have many opportunities to gain and practice leadership skills that will advance their college and career readiness. For example, fifth graders have the opportunity to apply for a Safety Patrol position where they have various responsibilities related to monitoring the safety of students. Fourth and fifth grade students also have the opportunity to serve as Student Ambassadors where they take part in multiple service opportunities where they practice their leadership skills. This year our Student Ambassadors help organize and facilitate many school events including our Food Drive. They also serve as speakers and guides during our Veteran's Day celebration. The VES News crew is another leadership role that gives our students a chance to learn and apply skills that will benefit them as they move on to middle and high school. We will also have a monthly CCLR focus and incorporate CCLR lessons in our daily curriculum and instruction. Our school also partners with multiple community organizations, including city government and Biz Town, to connect CCLR content and our daily student learning.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Mathematics Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Proficiency Levels of ELL and SWD Students	\$0.00

4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Mathematics Proficiency Levels of ELL and SWD Students	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00