

Sarasota County Schools

Venice Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
2019-20 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%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Venice Elementary School

150 MIAMI AVE E, Venice, FL 34285

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/veniceelementary

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	31%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	18%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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
Nutten, Danielle	Other	ESOL Liaison

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/1/2018, K IR K Hutchinson

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

4

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

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	58	82	104	87	96	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	512
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/13/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	83	102	91	103	87	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563
Attendance below 90 percent	0	5	2	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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	
	(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.

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%
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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	76
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	73
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Overall, the ELA proficiency of our lowest quartile was our least performing school grade component. The ELA and mathematics proficiency results for our ELL students was our lowest performing student group result. While these were our lowest performance areas, they were an increase from the prior assessment year.

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

N/A - all data components increased from 2018 to 2019.

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 student groups outperformed the state average, as well as the district average.

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

Our science proficiency increased 17 points from 68% to 85%. This is attributed to our use of the test item specification guides and an increased focus on the standard grade level expectations. Our teachers participated in professional development pertaining to our science standards. We also implemented a science boot camp during the 2nd semester. Our grade 3-5 teachers departmentalized their instructional delivery. Finally, all of our teachers are responsible for science instruction in their classrooms.

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

We had 6 (Reading) and 7 (Math) students score a level one on the 2019 FSA. We also have 8 students who have 2 or more indicators in the EWS database.

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

1. ELL Reading Achievement
2. ESE Reading Achievement
3. ELL Math Achievement
4. ESE Math Achievement
5. Math LG of Lowest 25%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The ELA and Math proficiency levels of our ESE students is lower than that of their non-disabled peers. The performance levels of this student group is below 70% for both ELA and math. The lack of proficiency for our ESE students has a cumulative effect on their school performance, and therefore is a focus of our SIP.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the 2021 school year, the proficiency levels of our SWD will increase to 60% for Reading and 68% for Mathematics, as measured by the FSA. Furthermore, the iReady diagnostic assessments should also indicate a proficiency projection of the same data points.

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 and math instruction with the classroom teacher. Furthermore, all iReady and diagnostic data and the iReady Teacher Toolbox will be analyzed to develop instructional strategies that support the IEP goals and the students' mastery of the grade level curriculum. The Striving Reader Decision Tree will also be utilized to assist in developing targeted interventions and instructional strategies. Furthermore, we have instructional staff trained in Reading Recovery, as well as staff trained in delivering multi-sensory systematic reading instruction (i.e. Orton-Gillingham) that will provide additional instructional techniques aimed at developing student reading proficiency. We are also implementing a new phonics instructional program in Grades K-2 that will help develop student foundational skills that will lead to increased student proficiency.

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. Furthermore, the use of a research-based phonics program and the multi-sensory systematic reading instruction is also highly supported by current research. The combination of these instructional techniques allows the students to demonstrate success on areas of need and the appropriate grade level expectations. Research demonstrates that targeted instruction and scaffolded support accelerates the acquisition of language skills and content knowledge of ESE students.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will develop lessons that focuses on the specific grade level curriculum through the identification of learning intentions and success criteria.

Person Responsible

Kirk Hutchinson (kirk.hutchinson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

The teachers will analyze iReady and additional student data elements through formative and summative assessments. They will then identify specific Teacher Toolbox lessons and interventions that address student needs.

Person Responsible

Kaitlin Randlett (kaitlin.randlett@sarasotacountyschools.net)

The Striving Reader Decision Tree will be utilized to assist in developing targeted interventions and instructional strategies.

Person Responsible Lori Christie (lori.christie@sarasotacountyschools.net)

ESE 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 Jessica Knarr (jessica.knarr@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Multi-sensory and systematic instructional interventions will be provided to students as needed.

Person Responsible Jessica Knarr (jessica.knarr@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The ELA and Math proficiency levels of our ELL students is lower than that of their non-program peers. The performance levels of this student group is below 70% for both ELA and math. The lack of proficiency for our ELL students has a cumulative effect on their school performance, and therefore is a focus of our SIP.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the 2021 school year, the proficiency levels of our ELL students will increase to 60% for Reading and Mathematics, as measured by the FSA. Furthermore, the iReady diagnostic assessments should also indicate a proficiency projection of the same data points.

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 ELL staff providing supplemental instruction to our students, which is in addition to small group reading and math instruction with the classroom teacher. Furthermore, all iReady and diagnostic data and the iReady Teacher Toolbox will be utilized to develop instructional strategies that support the ELL goals and the students' mastery of the grade level curriculum. The Striving Reader Decision Tree will also be utilized to assist in developing targeted interventions and instructional strategies. Furthermore, we have instructional staff trained in Reading Recovery, as well as staff trained in delivering multi-sensory systematic reading instruction (i.e. Orton-Gillingham) that will provide additional instructional techniques aimed at developing student reading proficiency. We are also implementing a new phonics instructional program in Grades K-2 that will help develop student foundational skills that will lead to increased student proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Research demonstrates the effectiveness of inclusive instruction. In addition to receiving specially designed instruction to address academic ELL goals, the students are also presented with the grade level curriculum and provided scaffolds and supports to demonstrate mastery of this curriculum. Furthermore, the use of a research-based phonics program and the multi-sensory systematic reading instruction is also highly supported by current research. The combination of these instructional techniques allows the students to demonstrate success on areas of need and the appropriate grade level expectations. Research demonstrates that targeted instruction and scaffolded support accelerates the acquisition of language skills and content knowledge of ELL students. Our ELL students are also receiving targeted mathematics interventions and support from additional ELL contracted staff.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will develop lessons that focuses on the specific grade level curriculum through the identification of learning intentions and success criteria.

Person Responsible

Kirk Hutchinson (kirk.hutchinson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

The teachers will analyze iReady and additional student data elements through formative and summative assessments. They will then identify specific Teacher Toolbox lessons and interventions that address student needs.

Person Responsible

Kaitlin Randlett (kaitlin.randlett@sarasotacountyschools.net)

The Striving Reader Decision Tree will be utilized to assist in developing targeted interventions and instructional strategies.

Person Responsible Lori Christie (lori.christie@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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 Danielle Nutten (danielle.nutten@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Multi-sensory and systematic instructional interventions will be provided to students as needed via contract service provider.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and 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. Even given this slight increase, this area is our lowest performing domain when considering all school grade components.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2021 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. Interventions will be developed using iReady Teacher Toolbox and additional research-based materials provided by the SCS curriculum office. Support will be provided to our mathematics teachers in developing these interventions. An emphasis will also be placed on our staff using the district GPS, aligning with standards, and using formative assessment and progress monitoring.

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 Steps to Implement

Provide most recent FSA and iReady data to teachers, specifically highlighting those students who are projected to be included in the lowest 25%.

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

Analyze FSA and iReady data, specifically highlighting those students who are projected to be included in the lowest 25%.

Person Responsible: Kaitlin Randlett (kaitlin.randlett@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Develop interventions to address student instructional needs.

Person Responsible: Kaitlin Randlett (kaitlin.randlett@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Implement interventions.

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

Review student performance on the interventions through the outcomes of iReady and classroom assessments.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

While these three areas of focus address our identified schoolwide improvement priorities, our administrative team will also be identifying those students who currently have two or more indicators from the early warning system. Most of these students are included in the identified plans listed above, but we will have additional levels of focus and monitoring for those 8 students.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

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

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

At Venice Elementary, we know it is critically important to celebrate and recognize the positive school culture and environment that our staff, students and families work so hard to build and sustain. Some of the main contributors to creating, building, and sustaining this positive school culture is a focus on relationships, unwavering open communication with families and a belief in celebrating successes along the way. Teachers use a variety of strategies including restorative circles, Arts Integration techniques and positive behavior support systems to build strong classroom communities and relationships with and among their students. These relationships are the building blocks for the rigorous academic work that students take part in throughout the school year. Our teachers use a variety of strategies to instill a growth mindset with their students so that risk-taking is part of the classroom culture for all. Relationship building transfers well beyond the classroom at VES allowing for trusting relationships to form between school staff and VES families. Teachers have multiple opportunities to meet with families to share information about the classroom as well as specific strengths and needs of the individual students. Open house events as well as one on one parent and teacher conferences are a few ways families stay connected to the classroom. This year, more than ever, we recognize the importance of helping families of both in person and remote learners to feel connected to school. We often share video messages to keep families in the loop of important information as well as to praise our students and families for their efforts during this difficult time. Our teachers share success stories, photos, and video clips of the daily happenings inside their classrooms to give families a “glimpse” into the school day through our various social media platforms. Another imperative piece of sustaining a positive culture is celebrating the success of our students, staff, and families along the way. One way we celebrate our students is through our Positive Behavior Support system. Students are rewarded in various ways for following school wide expectations including mini milestone events, such as a special snack from administration, eating lunch on stage in front of peers and taking part in special activities such as a “backstage tour” of the school. Teachers celebrate other teachers by sharing out “kudos” in a weekly update in which colleagues give each other shout-outs for the wonderful

things they are doing on campus for one another. School goals are shared with our community stake holders at the beginning of the year and then progress towards those goals is shared and celebrated at the half-way mark and then finally at the close of the school year. At Venice Elementary, building and sustaining the positive culture and environment are the top priority due to the implications doing so has on the success of our students both academically, socially and emotionally.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$15,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0211 - Venice Elementary School	Other		\$15,000.00
<i>Notes: ACCISS Grant Funding for contract services to support our ESE and ELL students.</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners				\$16,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100		0211 - Venice Elementary School	General Fund		\$11,000.00
<i>Notes: 0145 Contract Services for ELL instructional support.</i>						
			0211 - Venice Elementary School	Other		\$5,000.00
<i>Notes: ACCISS Grant Funding for contract services to support our ESE and ELL students.</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
					Total:	\$31,000.00