Garden Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Garden Elementary School

700 CENTER RD, Venice, FL 34285

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/garden

Demographics

Principal: Amy Archer

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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)	56%
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: C (53%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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

Garden Elementary School

700 CENTER RD, Venice, FL 34285

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/garden

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	51%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	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 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Archer, Amy	Principal	Administrators and teacher leaders work in a collaborative manner to support implementation and alignment of school improvement initiatives. Student performance data and school-wide trends are discussed and plans are made to address areas of concern in a proactive and collaborative manner. These discussions take place in a variety of formats. For example, Team Leader Meetings, Progress Monitoring Meetings, Grade Level CPTs, SWST, etc. Grade level Team Leaders facilitate collaborative planning activities during their weekly Collaborative Planning Time to gather and disseminate information regarding student achievement and plan instructional strategies to accomplish goals to help every child reach their fullest potential. A Progress Monitoring Team is being created to support the plans that are being made to support ongoing collaborative analysis of student performance data to determine students in need of intervention and/or extension. A Positive Behavior Support committee has been created to support the efforts that are being taken to enhance the social and emotional well-being of our staff and students. Staff listed below are a part of one or more of the School Leadership systems described above:
Carey, John	Assistant Principal	
Atha, Pamela	Other	ESE Liaison, Team Leader for Support Team, Progress Monitoring Team Member
Brown, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Grade 3 Team Leader
Davies, Will	Teacher, K-12	Grade 5 Team Leader
Davis, Joanna	Teacher, K-12	Special Area Team Leader
Davies, Tara	Teacher, K-12	Grade 1 Team Leader
Rispoli, Julia	Teacher, K-12	Grade 2 Team Leader
Welge, Brandi	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Leader
Strait, Mary	Teacher, ESE	Grade 4 Team Leader
Webb, Emilie	Other	Behavior Specialist, PBS Co-Chairperson, Support Team Member, CPI Trainer

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hunt, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	ESOL Teacher, Progress Monitoring Team Member, Testing Coordinator, Support Team Member
Bellanca, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	Reading Recovery Teacher, Progress Monitoring Team Member, PD Representative, School Literacy Contact for Guided Reading and LLI
Barnes, Aimee	School Counselor	Aimee Barnes is our School Counselor, PBS Committee Co-Chairperson, Specials Team Member

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Amy Archer

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

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)	56%
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: C (53%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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](#).	

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	94	98	79	81	92	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	530
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	4	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	23	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	2	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	7	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/20/2020

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	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	

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	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	7	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
	(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	67%	70%	-3%	58%	9%
	2018	59%	68%	-9%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	67%	-14%	58%	-5%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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				
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	54
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	48
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.

Learning Gains in Math for the Lowest 25th Percent (35%) was the data component that showed the lowest performance as measured by the 2019 FSA.

The ELL and Hispanic students performed the lowest among sub groups with 9% of the ELL students assessed who were in the lowest 25th Percentile demonstrating a learning gain in math and 20% of the Hispanic students assessed who were in the lowest 25th Percentile demonstrating a learning gain in math. These two subgroups are areas identified as being in need of improvement according to the ESSA Federal Index.

Contributing factors to these scores may include:
Enrollment data indicates an increase in the Hispanic and ELL population. Some of the incoming ELL and Hispanic families moved to the United States from countries with limited or no educational opportunities and/or disrupted or inconsistent educational experiences. In many cases, guardians of these students are non-English speaking resulting in limited academic support at home.

An increase in students meetings eligibility for free/reduced lunch has also been noticed. Garden was identified as a Title I school in the 2019 School Year (SY). This designation was only for the 2019 SY.

Limited support/staff allocated to provide supplemental support to children in need of intervention.

The professional development focus in the District for the 2019 school year was on ELA.

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 2018SY to the 2019SY was Math Lowest 25th Percent from 60% to 35% (-25%).

The subgroups with the greatest decline in Math Learning Gains with the Lowest 25th Percent 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.

Contributing factors are listed above in #1a.

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 subgroups, the ELL (9%), Hispanic (20%), White (37%) and Free and Reduced Lunch (31%) students showed the lowest performance in Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile.

Contributing factors are listed above in #1a.

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 from 2018SY to the 2019SY was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile from 41% to 52% (+11%).

Another area of impressive improvement from the 2018 SY to the 2019 SY was the Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile of Students with Disabilities (SWD) increasing from 33% to 57% (+24%).

Actions taken by our school community that contributed to the increases noted above are:

Garden's third through fifth grade teachers participated in District ELA professional development throughout the school year.

Teachers collaborated to incorporate high impact instructional strategies when planning for instruction for ELA and Math.

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

The number of students that exhibit one or more suspensions is an area of concern.

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

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on student performance data from the 2019 FSA, math focus areas for the 20-21 school year will include Math Achievement, Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest 25th Percentile Learning Gains.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021 school year: the percentage of students demonstrating math achievement by scoring a 3 or higher on the FSA will increase from 61% to 66%. the percentage of students demonstrating Math Learning Gains on the FSA will increase from 56% to 61%. the percentage of students making gains in Math Lowest 25th Percentile will increase from 35% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Archer (amy.archer@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Follow District PD, Instructional Plans and Pacing Guides (GPS) Standards-Based Lesson Planning Learning Intentions & Success Criteria Teacher Clarity Question Complexity & Task Alignment Progress Monitoring MTSS Process WIN Block (WIN = What Individuals Need) GLoSS, IKAN & Sarasota Numeracy Initiative Academic standards call for teachers to design rigorous and culturally relevant lessons that require students to use critical thinking skills to solve complex problems. Garden staff will participate in and apply strategies gained from district professional development and collaboratively plan to implement high quality instruction that is aligned to the state adopted academic standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Maximizing Math Mentality, iReady, MAFS and the Sarasota Numeracy Initiative will be the instructional resources used for math during the 20-21 school year. In addition to the time reserved for core math instruction, each grade level has a designated "WIN" block. Student performance data will be analyzed to structure grade level "WIN" blocks to provide students with additional learning opportunities at their instructional level in math. Grade level teams will be encouraged to use collaborative planning opportunities to apply the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) process to guide data-based problem solving and decision-making for supporting students.
Action Steps to Implement	

1. The Master Schedule and School Service Models were designed to support a continuum of services to meet the needs of all students.

2. Grade level collaborative planning efforts will follow the MTSS process to guide data-based problem solving and decision making for supporting all students.

2. Common grade level assessments will be administered to support ongoing instructional planning and progress monitoring for face to face and remote learners. The structure of the math block and the supplemental support offerings designated for the grade level WIN block (WIN = What Individuals Need) will be adjusted according to student performance data in math.

4. Progress monitoring efforts and actions associated with this focus area will be implemented on a continuous cycle to support accomplishment of School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals as well as Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) goals.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on student performance data from the 2019 FSA, the ELA focus areas for the 20-21 school year will include ELA Achievement, ELA Learning Gains and ELA Lowest 25th Percentile Learning Gains.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021 school year: the percentage of students demonstrating ELA achievement by scoring a 3 or higher on the FSA will increase from 59% to 64%. the percentage of students demonstrating ELA Learning Gains on the FSA will increase from 51% to 56%. the percentage of students making gains in ELA Lowest 25th Percentile will increase from 52% to 57%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Archer (amy.archer@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Follow District PD, Instructional Plans and Pacing Guides (IFGs) Standards-Based Lesson Planning Learning Intentions & Success Criteria Teacher Clarity Question Complexity & Task Alignment Progress Monitoring MTSS Process & Decision Trees WIN Block (WIN = What Individuals Need) Leveled Literacy Intervention Kits Academic standards call for teachers to design rigorous and culturally relevant lessons that require students to use critical thinking skills to comprehend complex text. Garden staff will participate in and apply strategies gained from district professional development and collaboratively plan to implement high quality instruction that is aligned to the state adopted academic standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SCS IFGs, iReady, LAFS and the will be the instructional resources used for ELA during the 20-21 school year. In addition to the time reserved for core ELA instruction, each grade level has a designated "WIN" block. Student performance data will be analyzed to structure grade level "WIN" blocks to provide students with additional learning opportunities at their instructional level in ELA. Grade level teams will be encouraged to use collaborative planning opportunities to apply the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) process to guide data-based problem solving and decision-making for supporting students.
Action Steps to Implement	

1. The Master Schedule and School Service Models were designed to support a continuum of services to meet the needs of all students.

2. Grade level collaborative planning efforts will follow the MTSS process to guide data-based problem solving and decision making for supporting all students.

2. Common grade level assessments will be administered to support ongoing instructional planning and progress monitoring for face to face and remote learners. The structure of the ELA block and the supplemental support offerings designated for the grade level WIN block (WIN = What Individuals Need) will be adjusted according to student performance data in ELA.

4. Progress monitoring efforts and actions associated with this focus area will be implemented on a continuous cycle to support accomplishment of School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals as well as Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) goals.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science Achievement is an area of focus for the 20-21 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021 school year, Science achievement will increase from 55% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	John Carey (john.carey@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Follow District PD, Instructional Plans and Pacing Guides Standards-Based Lesson Planning Learning Intentions & Success Criteria Teacher Clarity Question Complexity & Task Alignment Progress Monitoring MTSS Process WIN Block (WIN = What Individuals Need) Science Benchmark Assessments (Gr. 4 and 5)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Academic standards call for teachers to design rigorous and culturally relevant lessons that require students to use critical thinking skills to solve complex scientific problems. Garden staff will participate in and apply strategies gained from district professional development and collaboratively plan to implement high quality instruction that is aligned to the state adopted academic standards. Pearson Science curriculum will be the instructional resource used for Science during the 20-21 school year. In addition to the time reserved for core science instruction, each grade level goes to the Science Lab as a part of the Specials rotation. Staff are expected to follow the SCS grade level pacing guides to support alignment of classroom and lab instruction. Grade level teams will be encouraged to use collaborative planning opportunities to guide data-based problem solving and decision-making for supporting students in the area of Science.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Grade level collaborative planning efforts will follow the MTSS process to guide data-based problem solving and decision making for supporting all students.

2. Common grade level assessments will be administered to support ongoing instructional planning and progress monitoring for face to face and remote learners. The structure of the Science block and the supplemental support offerings designated for the grade level WIN block (WIN = What Individuals Need) may be adjusted according to student performance data in science.

3. Progress monitoring efforts and actions associated with this focus area will be implemented on a continuous cycle to support accomplishment of School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals as well as Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) goals.

Person Responsible   John Carey (john.carey@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2019 ESSA data indicates the English Language Learner subgroup is an area of focus for the 20-21 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021 school year, The ESSA English Language Learner subgroup will increase from 37% to 42%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	John Carey (john.carey@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) process will be followed to guide data-based problem solving and decision-making for supporting ELL students. Research-based instructional resources and strategies will be used to provide supplemental instruction/intervention to students who are in included in the Hispanic subgroup, meet eligibility for ELL and/or are considered to be in the lower quartile during the "WIN" block. Academic standards call for teachers to design rigorous and culturally relevant lessons that require students to use critical thinking skills to comprehend complex text. Garden staff will participate in and apply strategies gained from district professional development and collaboratively plan to implement high quality instruction that is aligned to the state adopted academic standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	LLI & The Sarasota Numeracy Initiative will be the instructional resources used to provide supplemental support to students in the ELL subgroup during the 20-21 school year. In addition to the time reserved for core instruction, each grade level has a designated "WIN" block. Student performance data will be analyzed to structure grade level "WIN" blocks to provide ELL students with additional learning opportunities at their instructional level in ELA and Math. Grade level teams will be encouraged to use collaborative planning opportunities to apply the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) process to guide data-based problem solving and decision-making for supporting students.

Action Steps to Implement

The action steps listed below will be implemented in addition to the action steps that will be taken for ELA and Math goals.

1. The assessments below will be administered to accurately and reliably determine each child's instructional level in Reading and Math:
Benchmark Assessment System (BAS)
Global Strategy Stage Assessment Strategy Screener (GLoSS)
Individual Knowledge Assessment of Number Knowledge Screener (IKAN)

2. Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) kits and resources from the Sarasota Numeracy Initiative will be used to provide instruction/intervention and monitor progress.

3. Student ELA and Math performance data will be shared with homeroom teachers on a weekly basis.

4. Progress monitoring efforts and actions associated with this focus area will be implemented on a continuous cycle to support accomplishment of School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals as well as Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) goals.

Person Responsible   John Carey (john.carey@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2019 ESSA data indicates the Hispanic subgroup is an area of focus for the 20-21 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021 school year, The ESSA sub group for Hispanic Learners will increase from 39% to 44%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	John Carey (john.carey@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) process will be followed to guide data-based problem solving and decision-making for supporting Hispanic students. Research-based instructional resources and strategies will be used to provide supplemental instruction/intervention to students who are included in the Hispanic subgroup, meet eligibility for ELL and/or are considered to be in the lower quartile during the "WIN" block.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Garden Elementary ESSA's Hispanic Learners 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%.

Action Steps to Implement

In addition to the action steps that are included in ELA and Math goals, the actions below will be implemented to support students in our Hispanic subgroup:

1. The assessments below will be administered to Hispanic students performing below level to accurately and reliably determine each child's instructional level in Reading and Math:
Benchmark Assessment System (BAS)
Global Strategy Stage Assessment Strategy Screener (GLoSS)
Individual Knowledge Assessment of Number Knowledge Screener (IKAN)

2. Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) kits and resources from the Sarasota Numeracy Initiative will be used to provide instruction/intervention and monitor progress for Hispanic students in need of supplemental instruction.

3. ELA and Math performance data will be shared with homeroom teachers on a weekly basis.

4. Progress monitoring efforts and actions associated with this focus area will be implemented on a continuous cycle to support accomplishment of School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals as well as Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) goals.

Person Responsible	John Carey (john.carey@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Administrators will work closely with the Behavior Specialist and School Counselor to maintain an intentional focus on the systems that are put into place to enhance Positive Behavior Support initiatives, in hopes of limiting the number of students who exhibit behaviors requiring a suspension from school.

Action steps to support improvement in this area:

During the late spring and throughout the summer, administrators worked collaboratively with the behavior specialist and the guidance counselor to identify PBS priorities.

Training was provided during pre-planning to support implementation of the Positive Behavior Support initiatives.

PBS Updates are provided by the Behavior Specialist at monthly staff meetings.

An emphasis has been made for staff to focus on maintaining positive relationships with staff, students, parents and community.

A PBS committee has been formed and will meet on a monthly basis to discuss implementation efforts of the PBS initiatives and problem-solve areas of concern. The PBS Committee is made up of representatives from all grade levels and the specials team.

CHAMPs will be used school-wide to teach and reinforce procedures and expectations.

The Gulf Coast Community Foundation Civility Squad has been embedded and incorporated into the efforts that are being taken to support the social and emotional needs of our school community. The Civility Squad promotes the 10 Keys to Civility, guiding principles and simple behaviors to improve the way we interact with one another.

Resources will be provided to staff to support embedding Social Emotional Learning (SEL) and creating an environment of respect and rapport while honoring the cultural and developmental differences among students.

The school counselor will provide SEL lessons to students in grades K-2 on the Specials Wheel.

Garden's morning news program will be used to provide SEL instruction to all staff and students.

Inner Explorer will be used to promote mindfulness. All instructional staff have access to IE should they wish to offer additional sessions to their students.

Individualized support will be provided to students who exhibit warning signs or behaviors of concern in a proactive and responsive manner, i.e., daily behavior check-ins with Behavior Specialist, Behavior Tech Aide and our School Resource Officer, CAARS, counseling, as needed with school counselor, MHT Referral, family meetings.

SWST will be utilized to recommended school counseling services for short-term counseling and MHT (Mental Health Therapy) services for students who may benefit from additional social and emotional services. The Mental Health Therapist (MHT) provides wrap around services to support student and family needs.

Monthly celebrations will be coordinated by grade level teams to recognize and celebrate student success with PBS.

Behavior Specialist monitors behavior data and calls made for support to identify trends/patterns to respond to students in need of intervention as proactively as possible.

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.

All staff and stakeholders are responsible for working to maintain a positive school culture and environment. Intentional actions and efforts are taken by various stakeholders to promote a positive school culture and environment.

Activities are planned for students and adults to be recognized and rewarded through our PBS initiatives. Some examples of the activities that are planned for the 20-21 school year include monthly celebrations, quarterly awards, PBS Parking Spot and monthly PBS drawings at staff meetings.

The Civility Squad traits have been incorporated into our school-wide PBS. Monthly calendars have been created to provide resources and daily opportunities for SEL teachings. KNN is used to support this PBS goal.

The Garden Sunshine Committee plans social events, offers a secret pal program, send cards/well wishes, coordinates monthly snacks/treats in the staff lounge and helps to promote a positive school environment.

Team leader meetings are opened with each representative sharing something that they are proud of and wish to have recognized by the group.

Efforts are initiated by Administrators to obtain feedback from staff to help provide support in areas in need of attention. Once feedback is provided, actions are taken to respond to areas in need of attention in a timely manner.

Grade level teams work in a collaborative and collegial manner to support instructional and social emotional needs of the students they serve.

SWST and CARE meetings are conducted to assist with problem solving efforts to meet student needs.

An emphasis has been made for staff to focus on maintaining positive relationships with staff, students, parents and community.

Teachers and staff are encouraged to maintain ongoing, open, honest and positive communication with families. A variety of methods are used for communication: Face to Face Meetings, Zoom Meetings, Email, Telephone, Text, etc.

Instructional staff will be asked to complete a minimum of two contacts with each student's family during the school year. The focus of the contact should be to celebrate student success, review academic, behavioral

and attendance goals and the progress that has been made toward goal accomplishment and to seek input/support from the parent/guardian to support goal accomplishment.

Agenda books and Garden "Green Folders" are used to support home to school communication. Classroom newsletters, graded student work and student progress reports are examples of items that are exchanged a minimum of one time each week for face to face and remote learners.

Parents and community members are included in the SAC.

Parents, teachers and students are encouraged to participate in the Parent, Teacher, Student Organization (PTSO).

Classroom teachers are awarded a $100 allocation from the PTSO each year.

PTSO leaders solicit Business Partnerships to help support classroom and school needs.

PTSO leaders seek donors to support their $100 "Adopt A Class" Initiative. Our adoption rate is 100%!

The PTSO sponsors quarterly staff lunches and Staff Appreciation festivities throughout the year.

The Garden Elementary School Web Page, Facebook Page and the Community Engagement Parent Link are used to celebrate and share school events, updates and successes.

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: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00