
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	19
Budget to Support Goals	21

Taylor Ranch Elementary School

2500 TAYLOR RANCH TRL, Venice, FL 34293

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/taylorranch

Demographics

Principal: Tara Spielman

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 PK-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)	42%
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 (67%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (67%) 2014-15: A (74%)
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	19
Budget to Support Goals	21

Taylor Ranch Elementary School

2500 TAYLOR RANCH TRL, Venice, FL 34293

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/taylorranch

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>39%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>16%</p>

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.

“to prepare students to reach educational success, social responsibility, emotional well being, and develop ethical values by providing a dynamic and relevant curriculum, effective instruction, and a safe, nurturing and confidence-building environment. We encourage a total commitment of students, families, community, and staff to attain to this mission.”

Provide the school's vision statement.

"We envision Taylor Ranch School as a community of learners. This community includes the administrators, teachers, support staff, students, parents, participating businesses and other involved stakeholders. This collaborative community is actively involved in researching best practices, analyzing student data, and expertly providing the best learning experiences and opportunities for our students and staff. Our dedication and outlook toward the future will work together so that our entire learning community will have the opportunity to achieve excellence."

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
Bolander, William	Principal	The Principal chairs this committee, setting the agenda and organizing the efforts of the Leadership Team to drive the school's school improvement efforts.
Eidelbus, Gretchen	Teacher, K-12	The teacher representatives are the link between the committee and the teachers at their grade level. They facilitate the implementation of school initiatives in support of school improvement efforts.
Archer, Michele	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Liaison is on the committee to provide a link between the ESE programming and the regular education classroom, especially for those students that are mainstreamed.
Hansen, Emilie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal co-chairs this committee, setting the agenda and organizing the efforts of the Leadership Team to drive the school's school improvement efforts.
Smith, Julie	Teacher, K-12	The teacher representatives are the link between the committee and the teachers at their grade level. They facilitate the implementation of school initiatives in support of school improvement efforts.
Loge, Laura	Teacher, K-12	The teacher representatives are the link between the committee and the teachers at their grade level. They facilitate the implementation of school initiatives in support of school improvement efforts.
Shepler, Diana	Teacher, K-12	The teacher representatives are the link between the committee and the teachers at their grade level. They facilitate the implementation of school initiatives in support of school improvement efforts.
Perez, Gina	Teacher, K-12	The teacher representatives are the link between the committee and the teachers at their grade level. They facilitate the implementation of school initiatives in support of school improvement efforts.
Doyle, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	The teacher representatives are the link between the committee and the teachers at their grade level. They facilitate the implementation of school initiatives in support of school improvement efforts.
Trahan, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	
Tuggle, Chelsea	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor is on the committee to provide insights into the connections between mental health and academic performance.

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	109	105	120	128	133	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	734
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	9	7	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	5	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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		2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

54

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

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	10	6	12	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	2	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	10	6	12	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	2	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	78%	68%	57%	72%	68%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	62%	58%	64%	63%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	53%	53%	57%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	81%	73%	63%	79%	72%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	67%	62%	75%	68%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	53%	51%	59%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	72%	65%	53%	63%	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	109 (0)	105 (0)	120 (0)	128 (0)	133 (0)	139 (0)	734 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (8)	8 (10)	9 (6)	7 (12)	8 (11)	7 (11)	39 (58)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	1 (1)	1 (3)	5 (2)	4 (2)	3 (7)	14 (16)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	2 (1)	0 (0)	3 (2)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (15)	25 (17)	17 (18)	56 (50)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

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	82%	70%	12%	58%	24%
	2018	79%	68%	11%	57%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	67%	6%	58%	15%
	2018	76%	67%	9%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	75%	68%	7%	56%	19%
	2018	66%	66%	0%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	81%	73%	8%	62%	19%
	2018	79%	72%	7%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	72%	4%	64%	12%
	2018	79%	71%	8%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	81%	70%	11%	60%	21%
	2018	65%	72%	-7%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	72%	65%	7%	53%	19%
	2018	65%	67%	-2%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
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	50	46	47	50	53	48					
ELL	43	60		71	60						
HSP	75	73		86	77		71				
MUL	58			69							
WHT	79	66	49	81	68	46	72				
FRL	69	60	38	69	65	44	61				
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	33	36	37	25	40	39	18				
ELL	53	62		60	62						
HSP	78	64		73	71		92				
MUL	67	45		60	91						
WHT	74	63	46	77	64	46	61				
FRL	64	54	42	65	63	48	58				
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	20	25	28	37	54	45	22				
ELL	53	80		65	80						
ASN	67			83							
HSP	69	76		74	77		50				
MUL	76	73		88	73						
WHT	73	62	51	79	75	62	66				
FRL	62	58	62	72	78	61	49				

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	67
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	76
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	64
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	
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	66
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	60
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 lowest performance came from students in the bottom quartile in Learning Gains in both math and ELA. Given that extra effort was provided to this group throughout the year, it is unclear what were the major contributing factors. An insufficient focus on standard-based instruction is suspected as a major contributing factor. We also suspect a lack of basic foundational skills in both ELA and math was a contributing factor.

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

All data points increased with the exception of 4th grade proficiency and learning gains, which were slightly lower. 4th grade writing scores were down significantly. Inconsistency in instruction and interventions were contributing factors.

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.

All data points were well above the state average.

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

Both math and ELA overall proficiency percentages were significantly improved over 2018. A greater focus on preparation was achieved by using iReady lessons in a more effective manner and embedding FSA style items in classwork and assessments. Writing scores for 5th grade made a significant improvement due to an increased year-long focus.

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

The number of students in EWS totaled 9, with 6 occurring in the 4th grade. Most of these students had excessive absences and FSA failures, which will be a focus of our planning for improvement.

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

1. Greater focus on bottom quartile learning gains
2. Effective standard-based instruction across content areas
3. Renewed emphasis on writing with a purpose across grade levels throughout the school year.
4. Consistent implementation of interventions for struggling students.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	There will be an emphasis on tracking and supporting those students in the bottom quartile of ELA skills proficiency and learning gains.
Rationale	If we increase and adjust our tracking and supports of struggling readers across grade levels, then these students will demonstrate an increased understanding and application of critical reading fluency and comprehension skills.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the year 2020, 60% or more of our bottom quartile will demonstrate learning gains on FSA ELA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will use the curriculum-based program iReady to monitor and provide explicit instruction to our identified group of struggling readers in the bottom quartile. We will also mentor students to take greater ownership in their own learning and guide them in setting appropriate growth goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We will focus on this group of struggling readers throughout the school year, by regularly monitoring iReady weekly lesson performance, iReady diagnostics and standards-based assessments, and through regular meetings between the student and their mentor. The data collected will drive the student/mentor conversations and the strategies identified to achieve the goals set for reaching their individual growth targets.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We will use 2019 FSA data, along with iReady D1 data, to identify our bottom quartile across all grade levels. 2. Our bottom quartile students in 4th and 5th grade will be partnered with a staff mentor. 3. Identified students will meet with their mentors at least bi-weekly or more frequently. 4. Mentors will support their students in self-reporting progress on iReady lessons and assessments, and AR. 5. Mentors will support their students in setting and monitoring at appropriate growth targets. 6. Mentors will meet to discuss student concerns on a monthly schedule.
Person Responsible	Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2	
Title	There will be an emphasis on tracking and supporting those students in the bottom quartile of Math skills proficiency and learning gains.
Rationale	If we increase and adjust our tracking and supports of struggling math students across grade levels, then these students will demonstrate an increased understanding and application of critical math automaticity skills and problem solving strategies.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the year 2020, 60% or more of our bottom quartile will demonstrate learning gains on FSA Math assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will use the curriculum-based program iReady to monitor and provide explicit instruction to our identified group of struggling math students in the bottom quartile. We will also mentor students to take greater ownership in their own learning and guide them in setting appropriate growth goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We will focus on this group of struggling math students throughout the school year, by regularly monitoring iReady weekly lesson performance, iReady diagnostics and standards-based assessments, and through regular meetings between the student and their mentor. The data collected will drive the student/mentor conversations and the strategies identified to achieve the goals set for reaching their individual growth targets.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We will use 2019 FSA data, along with iReady D1 data, to identify our bottom quartile across all grade levels. 2. Our bottom quartile students in 4th and 5th grade will be partnered with a staff mentor. 3. Identified students will meet with their mentors at least bi-weekly or more frequently. 4. Mentors will support their students in self-reporting progress on iReady lessons and assessments. 5. Mentors will support their students in setting and monitoring at appropriate growth targets. 6. Mentors will meet to discuss student concerns on a monthly schedule.
Person Responsible	Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3	
Title	There will be an emphasis on providing quality standards-based science instruction across grade levels.
Rationale	If we increase our depth of knowledge regarding the power standards in science in grades 3-5 and understand the connections between K-2 standards and the 5th grade FSA assessment, our staff will better prepare our 5th grade students to be successful on the FSSA.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the year 2020, 80% or more of our 5th grade students will demonstrate proficiency on FSSA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will systematically provide professional development to all staff regarding the articulation of science standards, with a focus on 5th grade FSSA expectations. The Science Lab Instructor will provide guidance and coordinate the lab experiences with standards-based instruction in the classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The overall FSSA scores for 2018-19 indicated a consistent average for correct answers in each science content area. These results suggest that instruction is equally successful in all areas. The rationale of focusing on in-depth teacher knowledge of power standards in all science content areas is expected to result in the improvement in the depth of student understanding and increase proficiency percentages.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide PD to teachers regarding the articulation of science standards, with a target of 5th grade FSSA power standards. PD will involve the use of CPT grade level collaboration to identify lessons/topics within the new curriculum that support the power standards. 2. Train teachers in the effective use of the new science program and supporting resources. 3. Coordinate the curriculum experiences in the science lab with standards-based instruction in the regular classrooms across grades K-5. 4. Monitor the results of the district benchmark science assessment and reteach standards where necessary. 5. Conduct a science boot camp review of FSSA power standards in the weeks prior to taking the assessment.
Person Responsible	Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#4	
Title	There will be an emphasis on purposeful daily writing instruction, that teaches students to express themselves in an organized manner and to use evidence to support their ideas.
Rationale	If we focus our instruction on quality daily purposeful writing as outlined by the 4-Blocks Literacy Model across grades K-5, we will increase our students' ability to write effectively and enhance their willingness to write in general.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the year 2020, the average writing score on the FSA ELA will be at least a 6.5/10 for 4th grade and a 7.0/10 for 5th grade students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will follow the 4-Block Literacy Model which requires 30 minutes of daily writing instruction. We will incorporate the strategies necessary in prompt style response writing throughout the year in grades 3-5.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Grade level teams will give common writing prompts throughout the year. Teams will use the results of these rubric scored tasks to evaluate the success of previously taught writing strategies and to derive next steps for instruction.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement the 4-Block writing strategies with fidelity across grade levels. 2. As grade level teams, analyze previous FSA writing data to develop areas of instructional focus. 3. Administer common grade level prompt style assessments on a quarterly, or more frequent basis. 4. Provide time for 4th and 5th grade ELA teachers to collaborate on common writing strategies. 5.
Person Responsible	Emilie Hansen (emilie.hansen@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).

N/A

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.

We use a variety of tools to build positive relationships with families. We host several community events on our campus each year. We communicate news to parents through our monthly newsletter. We facilitate connections with local organizations like the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts and Big Brothers/Big Sisters. We host a community group every Thursday called the Good News Club which focuses on a message of good character.

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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.

We currently have three pre-k classes at Taylor Ranch. These classes focus on students with exceptionalities. For other students, we have a screening program in the fall prior to the start of the next year to determine the readiness of coming kindergarten students. We also provide an orientation program for new kindergarten students to help them feel more comfortable with such things as the cafeteria and riding the bus.

In the scheduling process, teachers from the previous grade develop an excel spreadsheet with critical information for scheduling students into the next grade level classes and to highlight any academic, behavioral or social concerns.

Student transitioning from the elementary to the middle school are given a tour of the new facility and representatives from the middle school come to our campus to educate 5th graders on the programming at the middle school and answer any student's questions.

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

Our (SWST) school wide support team is responsible for supporting MTSS and coordinating interventions for individual students. As teachers assess students through formative and summative feedback, they make decisions about which students need extra supports at a Tier I level. Our school counselor is our SWST Coordinator, and the initial contact for teachers in the MTSS process. Teachers can receive support from our MTSS Coordinator for Tier I interventions, but typically she is the initial contact in setting the stage for referring a student to the SWST. Once a student is referred to SWST, the team meets (each Thursday) to discuss the students with the teacher present. Our team is composed of the Principal, Asst Principal, ESE Liaison, Counselor, SLP, School Psychologist, Social Worker, ESE Resource teacher and the teacher. During those meetings a plan is created to provide a Tier II or Tier III intervention, with the appropriate documentations. The teacher or SWST Coordinator would generally be in contact with the parents to provide feedback and get approval for any special programming. Tier II and Tier III interventions are provided in the student's classroom and through our intervention labs, which are managed by our ESE resource teachers. A running record (log) of those meetings is kept on each child by the team secretary. As the process unfolds, if interventions are unsuccessful the student may be referred to our CARE team.

Our SIP is monitored by the Principal's Leadership Cabinet, which is composed of the team leaders from each grade level, the Principal, Asst Principal, ESE Liaison, and Counselor. This group meets monthly to discuss strategies and results aligned with the goals of our SIP. The Team Leaders are responsible for discriminating this information to their individual teams during weekly CPT meetings.

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.

Taylor Ranch has established business partnerships with several local businesses. Examples: We partner with Chili's restaurant to provide a recognition lunch each quarter for students earning straight A's; we partner with the local Dairy Queen to sponsor a TRS library night which returns dollars to support our literacy program; we are currently working with West Villages and the Atlanta Braves to establish a business relationship that would be beneficial to our students connections to the local community.

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

We invite local organization leaders to speaker to our students. Our 4th and 5th grade students attend business related field trips to the BizTown facility.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: There will be an emphasis on tracking and supporting those students in the bottom quartile of ELA skills proficiency and learning gains.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: There will be an emphasis on tracking and supporting those students in the bottom quartile of Math skills proficiency and learning gains.	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: There will be an emphasis on providing quality standards-based science instruction across grade levels.	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: There will be an emphasis on purposeful daily writing instruction, that teaches students to express themselves in an organized manner and to use evidence to support their ideas.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00