

Sarasota County Schools

Garden 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	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

Garden Elementary School

700 CENTER RD, Venice, FL 34285

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/garden

Demographics

Principal: Amy Archer

Start Date for this Principal: 7/10/2019

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)	56%
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: C (53%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

Garden Elementary School

700 CENTER RD, Venice, FL 34285

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/garden

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	Yes	57%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

School Grades History

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

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 the Garden Elementary community is to provide students with meaningful learning experiences through the use of individualized instruction, technology, collaborative learning, and community involvement. Student success will be measured by ongoing assessment. Garden's mission will be accomplished through the collaboration of students, staff, and parents.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Garden Elementary community is dedicated to providing a supportive environment where all children have the opportunity to achieve their highest potential.

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
Archer, Amy	Principal	The Garden Leadership Team meets bi-monthly (or as needed) to ensure alignment of school resources with each grade level. School-wide trends are discussed and concerns are problem solved as a team. The Leadership Team facilitate grade level collaborative planning activities during weekly CPT meetings to gather and disseminate information regarding student achievement and plan instructional strategies to accomplish goals and help every child succeed. They also facilitate collaborative analysis of student performance data to determine students in need of intervention and/or extension. These meetings are the first step for recommending students to SWST.
Carey, John	Assistant Principal	
Atha, Pamela	Other	
Webb, Emilie	Other	
Pickert, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	
Brown, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Davies, Will	Teacher, K-12	
Davis, Joanna	Teacher, K-12	
Leary, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Davies, Tara	Teacher, K-12	
Daniels, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	
Rispoli, Julia	Teacher, K-12	

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	97	93	88	95	88	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	3	10	4	9	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	4	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	14	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	2	0	3	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	3	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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)

42

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/2/2019

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	17	5	5	8	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	3	3	4	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
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	20	35	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	17	5	5	8	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	3	3	4	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
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	20	35	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	59%	68%	57%	65%	68%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	62%	58%	63%	63%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	53%	53%	50%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	73%	63%	65%	72%	61%
Math Learning Gains	56%	67%	62%	70%	68%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	53%	51%	65%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	55%	65%	53%	66%	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	97 (0)	93 (0)	88 (0)	95 (0)	88 (0)	105 (0)	566 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	3 (17)	10 (5)	4 (5)	9 (8)	8 (8)	7 (10)	41 (53)
One or more suspensions	0 (3)	5 (3)	1 (4)	3 (4)	6 (7)	3 (5)	18 (26)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	13 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (20)	14 (35)	32 (14)	47 (69)

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	67%	70%	-3%	58%	9%
	2018	59%	68%	-9%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	67%	-14%	58%	-5%
	2018	49%	67%	-18%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	53%	68%	-15%	56%	-3%
	2018	64%	66%	-2%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	73%	-9%	62%	2%
	2018	70%	72%	-2%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	72%	-10%	64%	-2%
	2018	56%	71%	-15%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	51%	70%	-19%	60%	-9%
	2018	78%	72%	6%	61%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-27%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	65%	-13%	53%	-1%
	2018	67%	67%	0%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
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	31	53	61	37	51	57	19				

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
ELL	45	31		50	35	9					
HSP	42	28	10	52	40	20	67				
MUL	63	70		67	60						
WHT	59	52	62	60	56	37	51				
FRL	54	47	53	53	49	31	39				
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	26	27	32	43	36	33	46				
ELL	33			47							
ASN	90			90							
HSP	53	48		66	66		38				
MUL	44	36		78	73						
WHT	62	52	39	73	68	57	76				
FRL	55	52	46	67	65	57	55				
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	23	41	48	30	66	67	33				
HSP	53	60		62	72		75				
MUL	60	64		60	55						
WHT	67	64	46	65	71	69	66				
FRL	60	59	47	60	67	66	59				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
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	54
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	48
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 data component that showed the lowest performance was Math Lowest 25th Percentile at 35%. When examining sub groups, the ELL and Hispanic students performed the lowest among sub groups. ELL students scored 9% and Hispanic students scored 20%. Last year Garden was named a Title I school and had an increase in the Hispanic non-English speaker population. Last year the professional development focus in the District was on ELA and Garden had one ELL resource teacher.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Math Lowest 25th Percentile from 60% to 35% (-25%). The sub groups with the greatest decline were White and Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL). The White sub group went from 57% in 2018 to 37% (-20%) in 2019. The FRL sub group went from 57% in 2018 to 31% (-26%) in 2019. Last year Garden was named a Title I school and had an increase in the Hispanic non-English speaker population and last year the professional development focus in the District was on ELA.

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 component with the greatest gap was Math lowest 25th Percentile, the State was 51% and Garden was 35% (-16%). When examining the sub groups the ELL (9%), Hispanics (20%), Whites (37%) and Free and Reduced Lunch (31%) students showed the lowest performance.

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 ELA Lowest 25th Percentile from 41% to 52% (+11%). Garden's third through fifth grade teachers participated in District ELA professional development. As a result teachers worked collaboratively on lesson planning.

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

The area of potential area of concern from the EWS data is the number of FSA level 1 students in 4th grade (14) and 5th grade (32).

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

1. Math Lowest 25th Percentile
2. ELA Learning Gains
3. Science Achievement
4. The ESSA sub group of English Language Learners (ELL)
5. The ESSA sub group of Hispanics

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	Garden's lowest performing component in math was Lowest 25th Percentile. In 2019 Math Lowest 25th Percentile was 35% compared to 60% 2018.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the year 2020, the percent of students making gains in Math Lowest 25th Percentile will increase from 35% to 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amy Archer (amy.archer@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will focus on standards based lesson planning with emphasis on Teacher Clarity. Focused learning intentions and success criteria will enhance student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Garden Elementary student's performance data indicates that improvement is needed reaching proficiency in the content area math, specifically math Lowest 25 percentile which dropped from 60% in 2018 to 35% (-25%) in 2019. Academic standards call for teachers to use student performance data to design rigorous lessons that require students to use critical thinking skills to solve complex problems. Designing a focused instructional program that implements the state adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students. John Hattie's research found that Teacher Clarity had an effect size of 0.75, Garden's Lowest 25 Percentile students require more focus to make gains in their learning.
Action Step	
Description	1. The service model was structured to provide more individualized instruction and support to ESE and our lowest 25 percentile students
	2. Kindergarten through Fifth grade teachers will identify students who are performing below grade level and document students through their CPT meetings. Identified students will be scheduled for School Wide Support Team (SWST). The Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) will be utilized.
	3. Students with disabilities (ESE) will receive supplemental support, as noted on their IEP, during their math blocks and during their intervention block.
	4. iReady reports will be analyzed and the interventions in the iReady Toolkit will be utilized during intervention times. Garden will follow the Districts Standards Mastery schedule to progress monitor student performance and follow up with the necessary interventions.
	5. District Math Support Specialist were enlisted to provide on site professional development to teachers in

grades 3-5.

6. A student data wall will be constructed to give faculty a visual representation of students needs and student progress. Teams will use this data wall to progress monitor their students to ensure students are receiving the additional support they require for success.

7. Teachers will utilize the Math Guide to Plan for Success (GPS) to collaboratively plan with a focus on Learning Intentions and Success Criteria. The structure of the math block will utilize upside down teaching and include number talk, and problem of the day (number of the day for kindergarten only).

**Person
Responsible**

Amy Archer (amy.archer@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2	
Title	ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	ELA Learning Gains was the next lowest performance component and the lowest scoring component of ELA in 2019 (51%).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the year 2020, the percent of students making ELA Learning Gains will increase from 51% to 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amy Archer (amy.archer@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will focus on standards based lesson planning with emphasis on Teacher Clarity. Focused learning intention and success criteria will enhance student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Garden Elementary student's performance data indicates that improvement is needed reaching proficiency in the content area of ELA, specifically ELA Learning Gains which was Garden's second lowest component in 2018 and 2019. Academic standards call for teachers to use student performance data to design rigorous lessons that require students to use critical thinking skills to solve complex problems. Designing a focused instructional program that implements the state adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students. John Hattie's research found that Teacher Clarity had an effect size of 0.75, Garden's ELA students require additional focus to make gains in their learning.
Action Step	
Description	1. The service model was structured to provide more individualized instruction and support to ESE and our lowest 25 percentile students.
	2. Grades kindergarten- second will continue it's implementation of Running Records. The Reading Recovery teacher will lead the implementation of Guided Reading in grades K-5.
	3. The Reading Recovery teacher will support Kindergarten through Third grade students in small group instruction.
	4. District ELA Support Specialist will do professional development with teachers in second -fifth grades on the Reading Block & Unpacking Standards Process with Learning Intentions and Success Criteria.
	5. iReady reports will be analyzed and the interventions and enrichment in the iReady Toolkit will be the primary resource for reteach and intervention. Garden will follow the District schedule to progress monitor using the Standards Mastery Assessment in iReady.

6. Students with disabilities (ESE) will receive supplemental support, as noted on their IEP, during their ELA blocks and during their intervention block.

7. A student data wall will be constructed to give faculty a visual representation of students needs and student progress. Teams will use this data wall to progress monitor their students to ensure students are receiving the additional support they require to be successful.

8. A team of Garden teachers will collaborate with teachers from Wilkinson Elementary School to create common assessments that align to the complexity of assessed standards.

Person

Responsible

Amy Archer (amy.archer@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	Science achievement dropped from 67% to 55% (-12%) from the previous year. This is the second largest percent decline in all the component areas.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the year 2020, Science achievement will increase from 55% to 59%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	John Carey (john.carey@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will focus on standards based lesson planning with emphasis on Teacher Clarity. Focused learning intentions and success criteria will enhance student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Garden Elementary student's performance data indicates that improvement is needed reaching proficiency in the content area of Science, which dropped from 67% in 2018 to 55% (-12) in 2019. Academic standards call for teachers to use student performance data to design rigorous lessons that require students to use critical thinking skills to solve complex problems. Designing a focused instructional program that implements the state adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students. John Hattie's research found that Teacher Clarity had an effect size of 0.75, Garden's Science students require additional focus to make gains in their learning.
Action Step	
Description	1. K-5 Grade Level Pacing guides have been created for a new textbook adoption this year. These pacing guides will support instructional alignment.
	2. The entire school will be aligned on the same topic /theme all year which will support collaborative planning for the grade level and the science lab teacher.
	3. Classroom science teachers will engage and connect students focusing on vocabulary and using science leveled readers. The science lab teacher will follow-up these lessons with explore and investigate lesson reinforcing vocabulary and a hands on learning in the science lab.
	4. A Science Boot Camp will be conducted in the spring for 5th grade students to reconnect third grade and fourth grade standards that do not spiral in fifth grade.
	5. All fifth grade students will take the district science benchmark assessment. Results of the benchmarks assessments will be analyzed by classroom teachers and the science lab teacher.
	6. The District Science Support Specialist will provide additional support with the new

textbook series and it's
online components.

**Person
Responsible** Amy Archer (amy.archer@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#4	
Title	English Language Learners (ESSA Sub-Group)
Rationale	The ESSA data indicates Garden's sub group English Language Learners score is 37% which is below the the minimum of 41%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the year 2020, The ESSA sub group English Language Learners will increase from 37% to 42%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cheryl Pickert (cheryl.pickert@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will focus on standards based lesson planning with emphasis on Teacher Clarity. Focused learning intentions and success criteria will enhance student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Garden Elementary ESSA's English Language Learners sub group performance data indicates that improvement is needed reaching ESSA proficiency. Garden's proficiency is 37% which is less than the ESSA standard of 41%. Academic standards call for teachers to use student performance data to design rigorous lessons that require students to use critical thinking skills to solve complex problems. Designing a focused instructional program that implements the state adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students. John Hattie's research found that Teacher Clarity had an effect size of 0.75, Garden's ESSA English Language Learners sub-group students require additional focus to make gains in their learning.
Action Step	
Description	1. The ELL service model was adjusted this year to have an ELL teacher with paraprofessional support assigned to service all ELL students in grades K-5 which increases contact time for students in standards based instruction and skills based interventions.
	2. Kindergarten through fifth grade teachers will identify ELL students who are performing below grade level and document students through their CPT meetings. Identified students will be scheduled for School Wide Support Team (SWST). The Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) will be utilized.
	3. ELL students will receive supplemental support during the grade level intervention block.
	4. Running Records will be used to guide instructional levels in the delivery on instruction for ELL students.
	5. The Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) system, a research based (Fountas & Pinnell) learning intervention program, will be used to provide literacy support to ELL students.

Person Responsible Cheryl Pickert (cheryl.pickert@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#5	
Title	Hispanic (ESSA Sub-Group)
Rationale	Garden's data indicates the ESSA subgroup Hispanic Learners, score is 39% which is below the the minimum of 41%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the year 2020, The ESSA sub group for Hispanic Learners will increase from 39% to 43%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Amy Archer (amy.archer@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will focus on standards based lesson planning with emphasis on teacher clarity. Focused learning intentions and success criteria will enhance student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Garden Elementary ESSA's Hispanics sub group performance data indicates that improvement is needed reaching ESSA proficiency. Garden's proficiency is 39% which is less than the ESSA standard of 41%. Academic standards call for teachers to use student performance data to design rigorous lessons that require students to use critical thinking skills to solve complex problems. Designing a focused instructional program that implements the state adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students. John Hattie's research found that Teacher Clarity had an effect size of 0.75, Garden's ESSA Hispanic sub-group students require additional focus to make gains in their learning.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ELL service model was adjusted this year to have an ELL teacher with paraprofessional support assigned to service all ELL students in grades K-5 which increases contact time for students in standards based instruction and skills based interventions. 2. Kindergarten through Fifth grade teachers will identify ELL students who are performing below grade level and document students through their CPT meetings. Identified students will be scheduled for School Wide Support Team (SWST). The Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) will be utilized. 3. ELL students will receive supplemental support during the grade level intervention block. 4. Running Records will be used to guide instructional levels in the delivery on instruction for ELL students. 5. The Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) system, a research based (Fountas & Pinnell) learning intervention program, will be used to provide literacy support to Hispanic students.

Person Responsible Amy Archer (amy.archer@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).

The teachers and staff at Garden will focus on two additional areas of school-wide improvement, Social-Emotional Learning and Attendance. The need for social emotional learning (SEL) is evident in our PBS and behavior data. Attendance is a district initiative to continue to Strive for 5 based on the research which shows the correlation between poor attendance and lower academic achievement.

The following strategies will be implemented to address the SEL needs of Garden's K-5 student population:

- * Utilize the full-time Mental Health Therapist (MHT) to assist students and families. The MHT will provide therapy to students and family members who have been identified through our SWST/MTSS process.
- * Inner Explorer will be utilized school wide every morning on KNN by all students and staff.
- * CHAMP's will continue to be implemented school wide in all classrooms.
- * The PBS/discipline plan has been revamped with a new Behavior Management flowchart with an emphasis on positive proactive parent communication, teaching and reteaching behavior expectations, and relationship building.
- * The guidance counselor will support classroom teachers with Kelso (K-1) and Second Step (2-5).
- * Small group and individual sessions will be provided for students in all grade levels (to include but not limited to: Lunch Bunch, Behavior Check-ins, Family Meetings, and Restorative Circles).
- * Garden will continue with monthly character trait based themes and celebrate these character traits with families at a monthly assembly.
- * Targeted K-5 students will be paired with a staff member to mentor a student.
- * Garden's school wide kindness theme will continue with emphasis on the book "Kindness is Cooler, Mrs. Ruler" which will promote and recognize kindness school wide.

The following strategies will be implemented to increase school wide attendance:

1. The district "Strive for Five" initiative will be supported.
2. The SAC committee will support attendance with quarterly attendance incentives.
3. Student attendance will be monitored and district policy guidelines will be followed.

4. Teachers will implement attendance interventions and follow district protocols reporting attendance issues to the SWST team.

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.

Parents are encouraged to participate in the PTSO and SAC, volunteer in classrooms and chaperone field trips, as well as, perform non-academic clerical assistance from home or in the school. Grade level parent information nights are scheduled to address the Florida Standards, report cards, and the on-line parent portal that can be used to monitor progress. Parents are encouraged to attend the Donuts for Grown-Ups, Harvest Festival, the Gator Run and other PTSO events. A weekly e-newsletter and a Facebook page will be used to maintain positive home/school communication with families and the community. Many teachers use the Remind app in addition to student agendas as a communication tool.

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.

The School Wide Support Team (SWST), grade level Collaborative Planning Teams and the Children at Risk in Education (CARE) team monitor, collaborate and implement instruction and intervention to help to meet the social and emotional needs of students. A Mental Health Therapist is working with families, and students to provide in school therapy services to our neediest students. Restorative circles are used by the staff and classroom teachers to help students work through conflicts in a productive manner. CAARS (Counseling As A Related Service) is provided to students whose IEPs indicate a need for this support. The Behavior Support

Teacher provides individualized interventions to help meet the social and emotional needs of students, as determined by the SWST and CARE team. Interventions are progress monitored and modified, as needed, to support students with meeting social and emotional goals. . All staff members support CHAMPS and Positive Behavior Support plans in a school wide implementation.

Every day at Garden begins with an audio-guided mindfulness program called Inner Explorer. The program focuses on key areas of development, bringing mindfulness to education and helping students prepare for learning.

All staff have been trained in Kognito, a program to build capacity of the staff to lead real-life conversations that result in measurable changes in social, emotional, and physical health. Staff volunteer to mentor students who are identified as at risk socially or emotionally to support positive student outcomes in school. The guidance counselor supports classroom teachers with Kelso (K-1) and Second Step (2-5). Small group and individual sessions are managed for identified students in all grade levels (to include but not limited to: Lunch Bunch, Behavior Check-ins, Family Meetings, and Restorative Circles).

Garden will continue with monthly character trait based themes and celebrate these traits with families at a monthly assembly.

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

The STAR early literacy assessment is administered within the first 30 days of school and local assessment administered prior to school starting helps determine classroom placement and provides valuable information on readiness skills for incoming kindergarten students. An orientation for incoming Kindergarten parents is held annually in the Spring to introduce them to Garden Elementary. Prior to school starting in August a New Families Orientation is held to help familiarize students and families with the campus and key personnel. Fifth grade students take a field trip to the local middle school to acquaint themselves with the physical campus and observe 6th graders engaged in classes. The feeder middle school comes to Garden for an assembly prior to their field trip to promote their programs. The school counselor and ESE liaison meet with middle school personnel to share special learning and emotional needs of select students bound for their schools.

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.

Each support team member is assigned one or more grade levels to progress monitor assessments, attend PLC meetings monthly to facilitate discussion of Tier II students to determine if intensity and/or frequency of interventions should be adjusted. When the decision is made to seek support from the SWST team, the support team member will assist the classroom teacher in collecting and presenting relevant data to the SWST committee.

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

Garden Elementary will promote Career Awareness through the Kids News Network (KNN). KNN is a morning news program produced by students which will introduce students to the working world they will one day enter.

Garden also promotes participation in Take Your Son/Daughter to Work Day. This event allows parents to share their work experiences with their child.

Garden teachers will utilize the Quest component of the new Pearson Science textbook series to support college and career awareness.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest 25th Percentile	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains	\$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Achievement	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: English Language Learners (ESSA Sub-Group)	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Hispanic (ESSA Sub-Group)	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00