

Sarasota County Schools

Venice Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Venice Elementary School

150 MIAMI AVE E, Venice, FL 34285

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/veniceelementary

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.

The mission of Venice Elementary School is to implement a curriculum that personalizes learning and ensures collective responsibility among school staff, students, families, and community members that fosters high levels of student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Venice Elementary School's faculty and staff are committed to working as one for the success of all students.

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
Hutchinson, Kirk	Principal	Responsible for the daily instructional and operational aspects of the school.
Randlett, Kaitlin	Assistant Principal	Responsible for the daily instructional and operational aspects of the school.
Ellis, Helen	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Instructional Team Leader
DiPillo, Karen	Teacher, K-12	First Grade Instructional Team Leader
Banks, Susan	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Instructional Team Leader
Bartlett, Whitney	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Instructional Team Leader
Schafer, Jodi	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Instructional Team Leader
Reynolds, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Instructional Team Leader
Callan, Jeff	Teacher, K-12	Specials Team Leader
Fathey, Kaite	School Counselor	School Counselor
Hines, Chris	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Specialist and PBIS Chair
Knarr, Jessica	Staffing Specialist	ESE Liaison and Instructional Team Leader
Henderson, Kim	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach

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 SIP is developed with input from our SAC, which includes parents, community members, and school staff.

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))

Our SIP will be regularly monitored for implementation and student progress on the FAST PM 2 and PM 3 assessments will be used to determine effectiveness. We will also use the teach/assess cycle to ensure that ongoing progress monitoring is present. The SIP will be reviewed with SAC at the conclusion of PM 2 to determine if any adjustments are warranted based upon current PM data.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	20%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	44%
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	14	7	22	9	6	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	8	6	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	10	5	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	28	19	22	10	6	0	0	0	87

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	22	4	4	0	0	0	30

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	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	16	10	12	12	13	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	5	4	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	10	5	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	7	3	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	3	8	20	9	0	0	0	42

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	4	10	1	0	0	0	0	22
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	16	10	12	12	13	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	5	4	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	10	5	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	7	3	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	3	8	20	9	0	0	0	42

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	4	10	1	0	0	0	0	22
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*	73	65	53	77	66	56	78		
ELA Learning Gains				71			72		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				70			68		
Math Achievement*	81	68	59	82	52	50	81		
Math Learning Gains				79			60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				80			53		
Science Achievement*	77	69	54	77	67	59	68		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					60	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	75	68	59	74			55		

* 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	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
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	76

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	610
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	63			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	70			
MUL	81			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	63			

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	72			
ELL	73			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	72			

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	87			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	74			

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	73			81			77					75
SWD	42			52			40				4	
ELL	53			60							3	75
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	65			70							3	75
MUL	76			86							3	
PAC												
WHT	74			83			77				4	
FRL	58			72			67				5	69

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	77	71	70	82	79	80	77					74
SWD	54	74	82	66	86	80	73					58
ELL	56	75		67	92							74
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	56	67		72	80		90					65
MUL	79	90		79	100							
PAC												
WHT	80	70	72	83	76	75	74					
FRL	63	72	71	74	75	74	80					80

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	78	72	68	81	60	53	68					55
SWD	46	60	67	52	53	50	20					42
ELL	38			46								55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	57			67								53
MUL	75			69								
PAC												
WHT	80	75	80	84	62	67	71					
FRL	63	71		67	38		45					45

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	84%	67%	17%	58%	26%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	69%	61%	8%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	74%	70%	4%	59%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	91%	70%	21%	61%	30%
05	2023 - Spring	83%	66%	17%	55%	28%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	77%	67%	10%	51%	26%

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.

Overall, our ELA proficiency levels showed the lowest performance when compared to mathematics and science. Our Grade 3 ELA proficiency results have plateaued over the past few years and are hovering around 70% 3+. For this school year we have reallocated staff and student assignments to bolster the success of our current grade 3 students.

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

Our FAST results were very consistent when compared to last school year. While they did not decline, they did not increase significantly either.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

All of our student data exceeded that of the state averages/performance.

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

Our Grade 4 ELA proficiency data increased significantly. We attribute this to the fact that this team went to great lengths to ensure that their collaborative planning time (PLC) was focused on the essential

standards and utilized common assessments to determine their instructional success. Additionally, the allocation of an ESE teacher who only supported our grade 4 students allowed for increased frequency and intentionality of support.

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

The fact that we have 22 3rd grade students with multiple indicators is concerning. This is more than 5 times as many students than in grades 4 or 5. To address this concern, we have allocated additional ESE and instructional staff to support our grade 3 students this school year with intensive reading and ESE services.

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

1. 80% of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will score a 3+ on the ELA FAST.
2. 80% of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will score a 3+ on the Math FAST.
3. 80% of students in grade 5 will score a 3+ on the Science FSSA.

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 Professional Learning Communities**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.

When examining our student growth over the past few years, it is evident that some of our ELA scores have plateaued and continue to peak near 70% 3+ and our math scores remain in the low 80% 3+. In order to ensure that every student receives highly effective instruction every day, our teachers need to build collective efficacy by developing strong and consistent instructional practices through the professional learning communities framework. By using the teach/assess cycle and focusing on the essential standards and common assessments, every student will be ensured high quality instruction regardless of the classroom they attend.

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 2023/2024 school year, at least 80% of our students will earn a proficient score (40th percentile or higher K-2; 3+ in 3-5) on the end of year ELA FAST administration.

Monitoring:

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

Student progress will be monitored during the two initial FAST PM windows, as well as through district PM protocols and assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kirk Hutchinson (kirk.hutchinson@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.)

Teachers will be collaborating using the PLC framework to develop highly-effective instructional programs that identify the essential standards and use common assessments to determine student mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research abounds (Hattie) that indicates the impact that collective efficacy has on the success of student mastery. Using the PLC framework to ensure a high level of collective efficacy will ensure high levels of student success.

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.

Teams will schedule collaborative planning sessions where they will identify the essential standards, develop highly effective instructional plans, and select common assessments that will be used to measure student mastery.

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year. A calendar of dates has already been determined.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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.

When examining our EWS data, it is apparent that our grade 3 students have significantly more multiple indicators than any other grade level. Identifying these students (22 are chronically absent and 8 have multiple indicators) and providing ongoing supports and instruction will allow them to reach proficiency by the end of grade 3.

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 2023/2024 school year, at least 80% of grade 3 students will score a 3+ on the Reading and Mathematics PM 3 FAST administration.

Monitoring:

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

Student progress will be monitored during the two initial FAST PM windows, as well as through district PM protocols and assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kirk Hutchinson (kirk.hutchinson@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.)

Teachers will be collaborating using the PLC framework to develop highly-effective instructional programs that identify the essential standards and use common assessments to determine student mastery. Teachers will specifically identify those students who are accounted for in the EWS and provide systematic and intentional instruction and intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research abounds (Hattie) that indicates the impact that collective efficacy has on the success of student mastery. Using the PLC framework to ensure a high level of collective efficacy will ensure high levels of student success.

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.

Identify the 22 grade 3 students who are chronically absent and develop an attendance plan for them with their families.

Person Responsible: Kaite Fattey (katie.fattey@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: End of August

Develop and implement a comprehensive instruction and intervention program for the 22 students with multiple indicators in the EWS. Utilize the MTSS and PLC framework to ensure targeted and systemic instruction is present for these students on a daily basis.

Person Responsible: Kim Henderson (kim.henderson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: End of PM 1

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)).

N/A as Venice ES is not a CSI, TSI, or ATSI school.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

N/A, as Venice ES does not receive Title 1 funding.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A, as Venice ES does not receive Title 1 funding.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

N/A, as Venice ES does not receive Title 1 funding.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A, as Venice ES does not receive Title 1 funding.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A, as Venice ES does not receive Title 1 funding.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A, as Venice ES does not receive Title 1 funding.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A, as Venice ES does not receive Title 1 funding.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A, as Venice ES does not receive Title 1 funding.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A, as Venice ES does not receive Title 1 funding.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No