Sarasota County Schools

Taylor Ranch Elementary School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Taylor Ranch Elementary School

2500 TAYLOR RANCH TRL, Venice, FL 34293

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/taylorranch

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

"Taylor Ranch School educates ALL students to the highest levels of academic achievement and prepares them to become productive and responsible citizens. We encourage a total commitment of students, families, community, and staff to attain this mission. An emphasis on the shared responsibility of parents and families in a student's educational journey promotes high quality instruction for all learners."

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Spielman, Tara	Principal	Administrators and school-based 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, Grade Level CPTs, SWST, ect. Grade level Team Leaders facilitate collaborative planning activities during their weekly Collaborative Planning Time to gather and disseminate information regarding students achievement and plan instructional strategies to accomplish goals to help every child reach their fullest potential. A Positive Behavior Intervention Support team has been created to support the efforts that are being taken to enhance the social and emotion well-being of our staff and students. The principal is directly responsible for the oversight and monitoring of these student-centered teams and committees.
Parrish, Scott	Assistant Principal	Direct oversight of ESE staff and students and MTSS process and protocols. Responsible for progress monitoring data, instructional coaching and support, and support of school wide academic and social/emotional initiatives
Summerlee, Betsy	Other	Works with our 3-5 team to support student needs. Acting ESOL Liaison to ensure the ELL population is receiving appropriate instruction. Working with the PBIS team to support the Social Emotional Needs of the student population.
Tuggle, Chelsea	School Counselor	School counselor for grades K-2, Admin Support Team and PBIS Team member. Support all school based initiatives as related to students' academic and social/emotional growth
Reinhart, Morgan	School Counselor	School counselor for grades 3-5, Admin Support Team and PBIS Team member. Support all school based initiatives as related to students' academic and social/emotional growth
Barber, Jaime	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Specialist, PBIS Chairperson, Admin Support Team Member. Ms. Barber also services students with behavior goals on their IEPs.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Webb, Emilie	Other	ESE Liaison responsible for ESE compliance and facilitation, SAC Chairperson, PBIS Team member
Loge, Laura	Other	Reading Recovery Teacher, Literacy Team Member
Figueroa, Nathan	Teacher, K-12	Grade 5 Team Leader
Eidelbus, Gretchen	Teacher, K-12	Grade 4 Team Leader
Gilbert, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Grade 2 Team Leader
Johnson, Carla	Teacher, K-12	Team 1 Team Leader
Kay, Kelliann	Teacher, K-12	Kinder Team Leader
Mattoon, Deanne	Teacher, K-12	Grade 3 Team Leader
Sloan, Beth	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach. Responsible for working with teachers on implementation of Tier 1 teaching strategies. Part of the Leadership Team.
Rembisz, Katie	Other	Ms. Rembisz is our 504 and school-wide support team facilitator. She meets with families and teachers to create and update 504 accommodation plans. She is a member of our leadership team and works with teachers to ensure proper interventions and documentation are in place. She regularly monitors student performance to ensure needs are being met.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The TRS leadership team met to discuss end of year (22-23) data along with goals for 23-24. Based on the data, the team proposed goals for the new school year and discussed with staff for input. Once staff and the TRS leadership team agreed on the goals they were preliminarily presented to the School Advisory Committee for feedback and input from parents, business partners, and other stakeholders. Our SAC committee will reconvene in early September to review the draft SIP goals for 23-24.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored at our weekly leadership meetings as well as SAC and faculty meetings. The Team will use progress monitoring data to determine the effectiveness of its implementation. Based on the data during the progress monitoring sessions, input from our ALERT team, and our interventionists the team will make necessary adjustments.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	21%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	42%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	5	22	19	25	20	17	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	14	19	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	19	24	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	14	19	0	0	0	34

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	18	10	34	0	0	0	62

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	3	19	30	22	24	26	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	8	17	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	18	14	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	3	8	17	0	0	0	28

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	0	3	11	12	0	0	0	28

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	3	19	30	22	24	26	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	8	17	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	18	14	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	3	8	17	0	0	0	28

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	0	3	11	12	0	0	0	28

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	70	65	53	73	66	56	67		
ELA Learning Gains				73			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63			48		
Math Achievement*	70	68	59	75	52	50	69		
Math Learning Gains				73			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			47		
Science Achievement*	71	69	54	59	67	59	70		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					60	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	78	68	59	59			82		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	361
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	71			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	70			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	61			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	49			
ELL	72			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	73			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	55			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	70			70			71					78
SWD	38			33			35				5	70
ELL	68			63							4	78
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	73			62			56				5	85
MUL	68			71			55				4	
PAC												
WHT	70			72			73				5	64
FRL	57			55			57				5	73

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	73	73	63	75	73	63	59					59
SWD	37	58	61	46	58	48	38					
ELL	70	75		81	76		70					59
AMI												
ASN												

						2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK												
HSP	83	76		76	79		53					
MUL	76	76		73	67		71					
PAC												
WHT	72	73	57	75	73	64	59					
FRL	58	60	52	57	61	52	47					

						2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	67	60	48	69	56	47	70					82
SWD	22	40	36	41	63	55	38					
ELL	40			47			40					82
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	51			71								
MUL	81			71								
PAC												
WHT	68	62	52	70	57	44	72					
FRL	57	58		56	50	47	61					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
05	2023 - Spring	73%	67%	6%	54%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	67%	5%	58%	14%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	70%	61%	9%	50%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	74%	70%	4%	59%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	70%	3%	61%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	66%	9%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	68%	67%	1%	51%	17%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Third grade reading showed the lowest performance at 70% which was a decrease of 5% from SY 21-22.

Staff and students were navigating the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) for the first time. During PM 1, students were tested in the morning and afternoon. Not all students received unlimited time to complete. There were also technological issues with sessions shutting off during the exam, teachers having to restart the test session.

Teachers were learning the MTSS process and the how to use the Decision Tree to determine the appropriate intervention. Full intervention implementation was delayed due to Hurricane Ian.

We also implemented an afterschool tutoring program for 3rd grade students who were identified as a level 1 or 2 on the FAST. The Varsity Tutoring program students did not have the anticipated results, this cohort of students had an average of 1.75 percentile points higher than their peers not participating in the tutoring.

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

While third and fifth grade math scores improved, fourth grade math showed the greatest decline by 8 points, from 80% proficiency from 72%.

There has been a strong focus on ELA and ELA interventions, and the majority of our WIN Intervention Block is focused on ELA. New last year, the district introduced DreamBox as a new platform for Math. Teachers were learning DreamBox, moving away from iReady. Teachers were learning the shift in B.E.S.T Math Standards. TRS started the school year strong and had some setbacks after the hurricane. Many of our families and staff members were impacted and displaced.

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.

Taylor Ranch performed higher in all areas than the state average. TRS was 11-21 points higher than the state average at all grade levels and in all content areas.

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

The increase in overall ELA achievement has showed the most improvement.

Teachers have learned how to utilize the Decision Tree and were able to provide more targeted interventions. Creating a block of time in student schedules for What I Need (WIN) Time has been beneficial in providing targeted interventions. Training support staff to assist with administering assessments under the direction of a teacher and the decision tree has helped to identify targeted interventions. Grade level teams have been working together to plan lessons, provide interventions, and collaborate. Teachers met quarterly with the administrative leadership team to review progress monitoring data to help guide instruction. The school encouraged targeted students to participate in the New World Reading Initiative. Ten first and second grade teachers participated in the year long Strauss Literacy Grant, 6 teachers participated in Orton Gillingham training, and several teachers are being trained in UFli. There is a strong culture and clearly stated expectations from administration in relation to ongoing training in the area of literacy.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

1. Targeted interventions in ELA, specifically with our current 5th graders.
2. Increase diagnostic screenings and targeted Math interventions, specifically with our current 5th graders.

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

1. Increase the number of targeted math interventions.
2. Continue targeted ELA interventions, with an emphasis on 2nd and 3rd grade.
3. Improve MTSS process and provide targeted interventions earlier in the school year.
4. PBIS Platinum Model School.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

There will be a focus on providing high quality, differentiated Tier 1 instruction of ELA using Benchmark Advanced curriculum. Our teachers will focus on utilizing district progress monitoring tools to make informed instructional decisions regarding student groupings and targeted interventions. By increasing our focus on progress monitoring, we will increase our awareness of the effectiveness of our core instruction and make adjustments to instruction accordingly. With early intervention and ongoing monitoring, supports for struggling readers will be provided to target critical phonics, reading fluency, and comprehension skills. A special interest will be placed on 3rd grade since this cohort was in Kindergarten during COVID and has shown the greatest need for support.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the year 2024, at least 80% of our students will demonstrate proficiency on the FAST ELA Assessment and at least 80% of our students will demonstrate learning gains from AP1 to AP3.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Teachers will use the district progress monitoring tool for all students. Assessments vary by grade level and are conducted three times throughout the school year. Student progress will be monitored throughout the year. Teachers will also use our TRS OneNote notebook to document and monitor strategic reading interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tara Spielman (tara.spielman@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Through teacher-led data chats, students will use self-monitoring skills and set appropriate growth goals based on FAST Assessment Data. These practices demonstrate teacher clarity in relation to expected student outcomes and opportunities for feedback. Teachers will work as a team during the WIN time to ensure students are getting what they need to be successful. Our ALERT team will monitor student progress and help provide interventions as necessary. K-2 will have a specific emphasis on phonics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We will focus on monitoring student progress toward grade level standards through the school year based on the District Progress Monitoring Spreadsheet, and the FAST Assessment Data. Data collected will drive the student/teacher data conversations. These collaborative conversations will focus on identifying individual growth targets, strategies for achieving the goals, and how students are progressing. Student progress will be shared with families throughout the year.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Use a variety of data points to identify baseline data on student performance, and to identify struggling readers across all grade levels.

Person Responsible: Scott Parrish (scott.parrish@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Throughout the year, specifically after the AP 1, AP 2, and the iReady diagnostics.

Teachers will work together to develop strategic intervention plans for struggling readers. They will utilize common intervention time to best meet the needs of the students by grouping and sharing students based on academic needs.

Person Responsible: Scott Parrish (scott.parrish@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Throughout the year, specifically after the AP 1, AP 2, and the iReady diagnostics.

Administration Team will meet with teachers for data chats and to review fidelity of classroom intervention implementation.

Person Responsible: Tara Spielman (tara.spielman@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: 3 times throughout the year

The new Literacy Coach will provided targeted coaching to help increase the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction.

Person Responsible: Beth Sloan (elizabeth.sloan@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly

SWST coordinator will monitor the implementation of strategic reading interventions and proved support to teachers.

Person Responsible: Katie Rembisz (katie.rembisz@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Parents of students identified as struggling readers will be contacted monthly via a letter, to inform parents of progress.

Person Responsible: Betsy Summerlee (betsy.summerlee@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly

Three intervention teachers will be contracted. Grade level teams will identify students for targeted support (provided through both inclusion and pull-out small groups)

Person Responsible: Tara Spielman (tara.spielman@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: September through April, 3 days per week.

ESE Liaison will meet with ESE Resource teachers monthly to review student progress towards grade level standards and IEP goals. ESE Resources teachers will provide as much push-in support as possible to support our inclusion model.

Person Responsible: Emilie Webb (emilie.webb@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Weekly Meetings

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

There will be a focus on providing high quality Tier 1 instruction of Math using the district approved curriculum and the Math Pacing Guide. Teachers will focus on utilizing common summative and standards mastery assessments to make informed instructional decisions regarding student groupings and targeted interventions. By increasing our focus on monitoring student performance through common standards based assessments, we will increase our awareness of the effectiveness of our core instruction and make adjustments to instruction accordingly. With early identification and ongoing monitoring, supports for struggling mathematicians will be provided to target number sense, and algebraic thinking.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the year 2024 at least 80% of our students will demonstrate proficiency on the FSA Math Assessment and at least 80% of our students will demonstrate a learning gain from AP1 to AP3 as measured by the FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student progress will be monitored monthly based on classroom performance as well as growth on Dreambox. Grade level teams will collect and analyze data on student growth and achievement using standards based common assessments. Teachers will also use the TRS OneNote notebook to track and monitor strategic math interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Scott Parrish (scott.parrish@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Through teacher-led data chats, students will use self-monitoring skills and set appropriate growth goals. These practices demonstrate teacher clarity in relation to expected student outcomes and opportunities for feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We will focus on monitoring student progress toward grade level standards throughout the school year via: Dreambox, FAST Assessment, and classroom data. Data collected will drive student/teacher data conversations. These collaborative conversations will focus on identifying individual growth targets, strategies for achieving goals, and how student progress will be monitored. Parents will receive updates on academic progress.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will use a variety of data points to identify baseline data on student performance and identify struggling math learners across all grade levels.

Person Responsible: Betsy Summerlee (betsy.summerlee@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Three times a year

Teachers will work together to develop strategic intervention plans to meet the needs of all math learners.

Person Responsible: Scott Parrish (scott.parrish@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly

Teachers will meet with students to review data and set individualized learning goals. Parents will receive updates on academic progress.

Person Responsible: Betsy Summerlee (betsy.summerlee@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly

Administrative team will meet with teachers for dat reviews and to review fidelity of classroom intervention implementation.

Person Responsible: Tara Spielman (tara.spielman@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Three times a year.

SWST coordinator will monitor the implementation of strategic math interventions and provide support to teachers.

Person Responsible: Katie Rembisz (katie.rembisz@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Parents of students identified as struggling math learners will be contacted monthly regarding their child's progress and academic performance.

Person Responsible: Betsy Summerlee (betsy.summerlee@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly

ESE Liaison will meet with ESE Resource teachers monthly to review student progress towards grade level standards and IEP goals.

Person Responsible: Emilie Webb (emilie.webb@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Grade level teams will meet to analyze common standards based on assessments. This will include a member of the ALERT team. These teachers will plan interventions and groups based on data.

Person Responsible: Scott Parrish (scott.parrish@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Taylor Ranch will continue to develop a positive and welcoming environment for all stakeholders by following a PBIS plan. The plan will have components related to student expectations around school. By improving student behavior the team hopes to create an environment that encourages teachers to want to come to school. On top of a PBIS program that supports the needs of the students Taylor Ranch will also focus on reward, encouraging, and supporting the staff throughout the year with different incentives and events.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the 2024 school year Taylor Ranch will meet the PBIS qualifications to apply for Platinum Model School.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The PBIS team will use multiple data points throughout the year to monitor the success of implementation. The team will look at office support calls, referral data, and teacher needs assessment and feedback surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jaime Barber (jaime.barber@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The team will implement a schoolwide Positive Behavior Intervention and Support program to ensure all needs are being met.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By explicitly focusing on the behavior of the students, and developing interventions to support the students and teachers we will create an environment that is welcoming to all stakeholders.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

PBIS team will display expectations throughout the school. The team will also teach the expectations to students and staff through the TRS News, student assemblies, and at staff meetings.

Person Responsible: Jaime Barber (jaime.barber@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

PBIS team will bring the school together for different assemblies that focus on different PBIS goals.

Person Responsible: Jaime Barber (jaime.barber@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

PBIS team will monitor student behavior data during the school year. Based on data students will be brought up for support with the Schoolwide Support Team.

Person Responsible: Scott Parrish (scott.parrish@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).