



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Gulf Gate Elementary School

6500 S LOCKWOOD RIDGE RD, Sarasota, FL 34231

[www.sarasotacountyschools.net/gulfgate](http://www.sarasotacountyschools.net/gulfgate)

## Demographics

**Principal: Michelle Miller**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/10/2003

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	58%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: A (68%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Gulf Gate Elementary School

6500 S LOCKWOOD RIDGE RD, Sarasota, FL 34231

[www.sarasotacountyschools.net/gulfgate](http://www.sarasotacountyschools.net/gulfgate)

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">57%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">37%</p>

## School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	B	A	B

## 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 Gulf Gate School is to develop in all students their maximum potential by utilizing quality staff, supportive, involved parents, and a community geared toward helping students do their best today for a better tomorrow.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

The students at Gulf Gate School will become life-long learners, able to make decisions, solve problems, and lead healthful, responsible, productive lives.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Magac, Robin	Principal	Communicate school-wide vision and District initiatives. Provide the needed support and resources for successful implementation. Create and maintain a safe and positive environment for all staff and students to thrive. Lead and Facilitate the School Leadership Team. Assist with behavioral support.
Michalojko, Leigh	Assistant Principal	Assist in communicating and implementing the school-wide vision and District initiatives. Provide the needed support and resources for successful implementation. Create and maintain a safe and positive environment for all staff and students to thrive. Assist with behavioral support.
Lacy, Deborah	Teacher, K-12	Facilitate PLC conversations and collaboration about curriculum and instructional strategies, analyze common assessments and share successful instructional strategies with the kindergarten team.
McKenzie, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	Facilitate PLC conversations and collaboration about curriculum and instructional strategies, analyze common assessments and share successful instructional strategies with the first grade team.
Eissler, Erin	Teacher, K-12	Facilitate PLC conversations and collaboration about curriculum and instructional strategies, analyze common assessments and share successful instructional strategies with the second grade team.
Umstead, Tasha	Teacher, K-12	Facilitate PLC conversations and collaboration about curriculum and instructional strategies, analyze common assessments and share successful instructional strategies with the third grade team.
Kreger, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	Facilitate PLC conversations and collaboration about curriculum and instructional strategies, analyze common assessments and share successful instructional strategies with the fourth grade team.
Yoder, Michelle	Teacher, PreK	Facilitate PLC conversations and collaboration about curriculum and instructional strategies, analyze common assessments and share successful instructional strategies with the pre-k team and support personnel.
Morey, Teresa	School Counselor	Communicate information to the staff regarding specific District initiatives such as; the intervention process, CHAMPS, SEL and PBIS. Provide behavioral support for students and lead guidance lessons focusing on the principles of the civility squad. Lead the School-Wide Support Team and assist with data collection of FBAs and BIPs. Collect student intervention paperwork.
Evers, Paul	Teacher, K-12	Facilitate PLC conversations and collaboration on student needs and strategies for instruction. Communicate district initiatives pertaining to school wide-vision with the specials team.



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Seul, Margaret	Teacher, ESE	Provide services, coaching and assistance to regular staff members who work with mainstreamed ESE students and staff members in self-contained ESE classrooms. Provide assistance and information to parents of ESE students. Facilitate CARE meetings and provide updates to ESE teachers and principal.
Boehm, Katherine	Teacher, K-12	Facilitate PLC conversations and collaboration about curriculum and instructional strategies, analyze common assessments and share successful instructional strategies with the fifth grade team.

**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	111	103	112	125	93	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	651
Attendance below 90 percent	2	11	7	17	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	5	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

53

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 9/5/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	17	11	14	18	17	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	15	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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

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

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	17	11	14	18	17	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	15	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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

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

**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	75%	68%	57%	74%	68%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	62%	58%	66%	63%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	53%	53%	52%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	73%	73%	63%	75%	72%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	67%	62%	65%	68%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	53%	51%	55%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	65%	53%	68%	64%	51%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	111 (0)	103 (0)	112 (0)	125 (0)	93 (0)	107 (0)	651 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 (17)	11 (11)	7 (14)	17 (18)	7 (17)	16 (10)	60 (87)
One or more suspensions	2 (1)	0 (2)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (1)	2 (1)	6 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (5)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	2 (1)	2 (7)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (15)	5 (15)	29 (20)	38 (50)

#### Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	77%	70%	7%	58%	19%
	2018	73%	68%	5%	57%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	67%	1%	58%	10%
	2018	71%	67%	4%	56%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	73%	68%	5%	56%	17%
	2018	69%	66%	3%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	75%	73%	2%	62%	13%
	2018	68%	72%	-4%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	72%	-8%	64%	0%
	2018	69%	71%	-2%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	75%	70%	5%	60%	15%
	2018	70%	72%	-2%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	69%	65%	4%	53%	16%
	2018	63%	67%	-4%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	38	43	29	46	49	36	40				
ELL	70	61	50	73	66	36	65				
HSP	71	70	44	69	65	36	71				
MUL	73	70		87	80						
WHT	76	59	48	73	68	50	71				
FRL	66	58	38	64	62	37	61				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	41	44	33	42	49	48	32				
ELL	46	65	57	52	78	60					
HSP	59	62	54	59	62	55	52				
MUL	75			67							
WHT	75	58	39	73	63	50	65				
FRL	63	57	47	62	59	50	51				
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	43	60	59	49	50	52	31				
ELL	44	50	54	58	65						
ASN	80			80							
BLK	73			82							
HSP	57	54	39	63	67	60	41				
MUL	70			80							
WHT	80	70	57	77	63	52	72				
FRL	65	58	44	67	62	56	60				

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	522
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	62
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	78
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

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

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

Our students with disabilities performed the lowest in all areas. There was a decline in performance in all areas except for Science Achievement - which went up eight points from the previous year. The students in the lowest 25th Percentile showed the lowest performance in both ELA and Math. Our students on free and reduced lunch showed low performance in making learning gains in both ELA and Math.

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

Overall, our Math lowest 25th Percentile went down from 50% (2018) to 44%. All other areas showed an increase from the previous year. In looking at subgroups the greatest decline was the learning gains of our ELL students who are also categorized being in the lowest 25th percentile. There was a difference of 24 percentage points (from 60% (2018) to 36%).

**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.**

Our students in the lowest 25th Percentile had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. In ELA we were at 47% and the state was at 53%. In math, we are at 44% and the state was at 51%.

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

Overall, our science Achievement increased by 11 points. In looking at sub-groups, the overall achievement of our ELL students increased by 24 percentage points in ELA and 21 percentage points in Math. The Science improvement is attributed to more hands on Science Instruction, an increased amount of instructional time, and Grade 5 partaking in a "Science Bootcamp" In which they reviewed third and fourth grade standards. The ELL improvement is attributed to reciprocity between what is taught in the classroom and what is worked on in small groups and subsequently the use of i-ready to target skills.

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

Our students with disabilities and our economically disadvantaged students were our two lowest areas even though they were not below 41%, and therefore did not miss the target.

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

1. ELA instruction- primarily the learning gains of students with disabilities and our bottom quartile
2. Math instruction-primarily the learning gains of students with disabilities and our bottom quartile
3. Science across all grade levels
4. Social Emotional Learning
5. Attendance Awareness

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**



#1	
<b>Title</b>	ELA Goal
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>We reviewed school-wide data with grade level teams and support personnel. Data shows that 75% of students across grade levels 3, 4, and 5 are considered proficient on the ELA FSA. We want to continue on this upward trajectory (72% were considered proficient in 2018). We specifically discussed student groups where less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency. Our major areas of focus are our bottom quartile and students with disabilities. 47% of students in our lowest 25th percentile demonstrated proficiency in ELA. We had a very slight increase from the previous year of one percentage point. Our ESE population performed the lowest of our subgroups with 38% proficiency. These two subgroups in particular will require differentiated instruction to close the learning gap. Subsequently, we also want to ensure all students are making a year's growth.</p>
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>By the year 2020:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 51% of the students in the Lowest Quartile will demonstrate proficiency in ELA.</li> <li>2. The ESE student group will increase in proficiency from 38% to 42% on the ELA FSA.</li> <li>3. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency. There will be a four percentage point increase for all students when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency.</li> <li>4. There will be a minimum for a four percentage point increase for all students when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.</li> </ol>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Leigh Michalojko (leigh.michalojko@sarasotacountychools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Strategies include: ELA PD, resources to supplement curriculum, teacher clarity in the MTSS process for those students who do not respond to TIER 1 instruction, utilizing PLCs to collaboratively discuss students and proactively use the Striving Readers Decision tree to make instructional decisions, Reading Recovery to close the reading gap in the optimal year of first grade (the Reading Recovery teacher also works with small groups of second and third grades and provides training to our K,1, and 2 teachers). For our ESE students specifically: Access to grade level text with support at instructional level, collaboration between ESE teachers and general education teachers), verbiage on the IEPs allow resource students to remain in classrooms for instruction if it would be beneficial (case by case basis), full time rooms are also utilized as resource rooms for flexibility, present levels on IEP are derived from i-Ready (school-wide measure).</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>According to John Hattie's research, teacher clarity has an effect size of .75, response to intervention has an effect size of 1.29, and collective efficacy has an effect size of 1.57. It is the hope that utilization of these research-based strategies will help us close the gap with the students who are in the bottom quartile and help close the learning gap for our ESE students. Reading Recovery is a program that is listed on What Works Clearinghouse- which is based on researched-based evidence.</p>
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Providing professional development and needed resources for teachers</li> <li>2. Collaborative PLCs- using the Striving Readers Decision Tree</li> <li>3. Utilization of the school-wide support team to assist in planning purposeful interventions</li> <li>4. Staff Mentor Program for our neediest students- Tiger T.A.L.K.S</li> <li>5. Daily intervention block built into the schedule</li> </ol>



- 6. Clear learning intentions and success criteria
- 7. Staff investment in the school vision

**Person Responsible** Robin Magac (robin.magac@sarasotacountyschools.net)

---

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Math Goal
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>We reviewed school-wide data with grade level teams and support personnel. Data shows that 73% of students across grade levels 3, 4, and 5 are considered proficient on the Math FSA. We want to support overall achievement in Math and continue on this upward trajectory (70% were considered proficient in 2018). We specifically discussed student groups where less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency. Our major areas of focus are our bottom quartile and students with disabilities. 44% of students in our lowest 25th percentile demonstrated proficiency in Math. The previous year, 50% of our students in this group demonstrated proficiency. Our ESE population performed the lowest of all subgroups. We know these populations of students will require additional support in order to close the learning gap and show growth in this area. Subsequently, we also want to ensure all students are making a year's growth.</p>
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>By the year 2020:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 49% of the students in the Lowest Quartile will demonstrate proficiency in Math.</li> <li>2. The ESE student group will increase in proficiency from 46% to 50%.</li> <li>3. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency. There will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all students when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency.</li> <li>4. There will be a minimum for a four percentage point increase for all students when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.</li> </ol>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Leigh Michalojko (leigh.michalojko@sarasotacountyschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Strategies include: Math PD, resources to supplement curriculum, direct instruction of skills, teacher clarity in the MTSS process for those students who do not respond to TIER 1 instruction, utilizing PLCs to collaboratively discuss students. For our ESE students specifically: collaboration between ESE teachers and general education teachers (including sharing of lesson plans), verbiage on the IEPs allow resource students to remain in classrooms for instruction if it would be beneficial (case by case basis), full time rooms are also utilized as resource rooms for flexibility, present levels on IEP are derived from i-Ready (school-wide measure).</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>According to John Hattie's research, teacher clarity has an effect size of .75, response to intervention has an effect size of 1.29, direct instruction has an effect size of .60, and collective efficacy has an effect size of 1.57. It is the hope that utilization of these research-based strategies will help us close the gap with the students who are in the bottom quartile and help close the learning gap for our ESE students.</p>
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Providing professional development and needed resources for teachers</li> <li>2. Collaborative PLCS- sharing resources</li> <li>3. Utilization of the school-wide support team to assist in planning purposeful interventions</li> <li>4. Staff Mentor Program for our neediest students- Tiger T.A.L.K.S</li> <li>5. Daily intervention block built into the schedule</li> <li>6. Clear learning intentions and success criteria</li> <li>7. Staff investment in the school vision.</li> </ol>

**Person Responsible** Robin Magac (robin.magac@sarasotacountyschools.net)

### #3

**Title** Science Goal

**Rationale** We reviewed are overall Science scores with staff- including our sub-group data. We had the largest increase in our Science scores overall and all of our sub-groups made gains from the previous year. We want to continue on this upward trajectory.

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve**

By the year 2020, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all students when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all students where 70% ore more are currently demonstrating proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Robin Magac (robin.magac@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy**

Science is incorporated into the curriculum grades K-5. Teachers receive a monthly calendar with the Science Topic for the month. They also received the end of the year benchmark for their respective grade level in order to discuss in PLCs what students should know and be able to do by the end of the year. Additionally, 5th grade will continue to have their "Science Bootcamp" which consists of hands on activities and a review of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Science Standards. Additionally, we would like to have more of a STEM focus this year with our Science lab being more hands-on and the piloting of an after school STEM program.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**

Research shows the importance of teacher clarity. With the monthly calendars and benchmark review, teachers are able to plan with the end goals in mind and set clear learning intentions. Research supports instruction in STEM is an important component for our students to be able to bring knowledge and skills to solve problems, make sense of information, and know how to gather and evaluate evidence to make decisions.

### Action Step

**Description**

1. Monthly Science calendar for each grade level
2. All teachers are provided with copies of the end of the year Science benchmark to guide instruction
3. Hands on instruction in lab and classrooms
4. Stem After-School Program being offered this year

**Person Responsible**

Leigh Michalojko (leigh.michalojko@sarasotacountyschools.net)

<b>#4</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Attendance Goal
<b>Rationale</b>	We looked at our attendance data for last school year compared to the prior year. In all grade levels except for first grade (we remained the same number), our number of students with attendance below 90% decreased. This was most notable in kindergarten. We meet weekly as a school-wide support team and discuss students with chronic absences. Those students are put on the schedule to determine interventions.

<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By the year 2020, there will be a reduction of students considered chronically absent from the previous year.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Robin Magac (robin.magac@sarasotacountyschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Use of school-wide support team to keep an pulse of on students who are chronically absent and help determine interventions for the teachers. Additionally, promoting attendance through Strive for Five and incentives for students.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	As a school, we want to make sure we keep a pulse on the students who are considered chronically absent. We use time at our school-wide support team meetings to discuss these students and take action. We also have monthly incentives and participate in Attendance Awareness month.

<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Discuss students at SWST</li> <li>2. Interventions for students who are chronically absent</li> <li>3. Letters home to families</li> <li>4. Monthly incentives for classroom</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Teresa Morey (teresa.morey@sarasotacountyschools.net)

<b>#5</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Suspension/Behavioral Goal
<b>Rationale</b>	In looking at our suspension/referral data we would like to minimize the number of students who receive referrals, specifically those that result in out of school suspensions. Our number of students suspended, while low, remained relatively the same from the previous year. We want to be proactive in teaching students to become life-long learners, able to make decisions, solve problems, and lead healthful, responsible, productive lives.

<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	100% of the students and staff will participate in PBIS, Champs, restorative strategies, and understand the principals of civility through use off the civility squad an corresponding lessons.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Robin Magac (robin.magac@sarasotacountyschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	PBIS, Restorative Strategies, and CHAMPS are all researched based tools to instruct students on behavior management and help foster social emotional growth, so they can thrive academically.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students cannot meet academic expectations unless their behaviors are regulated and they are in a safe, structured school environment that promotes focus on the whole child.

<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All teachers are CHAMPS trained</li> <li>2. All teachers getting trained in Restorative Strategies (we are a model school)</li> <li>3. Staff partook in the Kognito training</li> <li>5.. Counselors cabana on the morning news promoting the principles of civility</li> <li>6. Admin team trained in Restorative Meetings</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Leigh Michalojko (leigh.michalojko@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

Our remaining school wide improvement priorities include:

1. School safety-which we address via our school safety team which meets monthly, through debriefing after our monthly drills, and close communication with our SRO.
2. Students becoming college and career ready- which we address through curriculum, career day, BIZ town, promoting the principles of civility (civility squad), and promoting the various colleges that staff attended on the morning news.

**Part IV: Title I Requirements**

### **Additional Title I Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

#### **Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

Open House, ELL Family Nights, Bring Your Family to Lunch Week, PTO Meetings (monthly), IEP Meetings, Parent/Teacher Conferences, Parent Information Night, Clothes Closet on Campus, Backpack Program, Mobile Food Pantry, Meet Your Teacher, Running Club, STEM after school club, SAC Meetings (monthly), Evening Student Performances, STEM Fair, and many PTO Family Events (Bingo Night, Movie Night, Fall Carnival, etc.), Website, Connect Ed phone messages, text messages.

#### **PFEP Link**

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

#### **Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

Our school is a model school for Restorative Strategies. All of our instructional staff will be trained in this process by mid-October. Our staff also participated in the Kognito training successfully. Our school counselor addresses the social-emotional needs of our students on a regular basis. For more severe needs, we have mental health therapist on campus. We also have our Tiger T.A.L.K.S program in which staff members mentor students who are a part of our bottom quartile.

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

Our school counselor assists the 5th grade students by providing middle school transition lessons to each class. The counselor accompanies students on field trips to area middle schools in the Spring. Both the school counselor and the school ESE Liaison participate in transition meetings between the elementary and middle schools which allows us the opportunity to provide the middle schools with pertinent student information.

#### **Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

School leadership identifies and aligns all available resources by analyzing various components of school data on a regular basis, getting feedback from staff and keeping communication open with families. School leadership uses this data to determine best use of funds (for example to purchase resources) and how to best utilize staff in order to increase student achievement. All decisions are made by answering the question, "What would be the best for the students?"

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

Each year, Gulf Gate Elementary hosts Career Day for our 5th Grade Students. Community members, from a variety of employment areas, visit and discuss their careers with our students. Students have the

opportunities to ask questions, take part in discussions and learn about career paths they have an interest in.

Gulf Gate Elementary will promote the different colleges that our staff have attended on the morning news programs (Tiger Town News). This will allow our students to see "beyond" our school and "into" the future as they make their way through middle and high school.

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Goal				\$22,413.37
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
5000	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		\$10,608.82	
<i>Notes: i-Ready lab contracted personnel to provide teachers a set block of time for interventions.</i>						
5000	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		\$270.00	
<i>Notes: Starfall to support early literacy.</i>						
5000		0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		\$75.00	
<i>Notes: Reading Recovery Council Membership for our Reading Recovery Teacher.</i>						
5000	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		\$3,900.00	
<i>Notes: IXL reading to support standards-based instruction.</i>						
5000	520-Textbooks	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		\$4,942.36	
<i>Notes: Curriculum Associates LAFS to use as resource to supplement the ELA curriculum.</i>						
5000	520-Textbooks	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		\$1,617.66	
<i>Notes: Curriculum Associates FOCUS books for our ESE teachers.</i>						
5000	520-Textbooks	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		\$999.53	
<i>Notes: Scholastic books for new teachers to help build their classroom libraries with books at various instructional levels.</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Goal				\$19,451.18
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
5000	140-Substitute Teachers	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		\$10,608.82	
<i>Notes: i-Ready lab contracted personnel to provide teachers a set block of time for interventions.</i>						
5000	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		\$3,900.00	

			<i>Notes: IXL Math to help support standards-based instruction.</i>			
	5000	520-Textbooks	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		\$4,942.36
			<i>Notes: Curriculum Associates MAFS as a supplemental resource in the Math block.</i>			
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Science Goal</b>				<b>\$5,609.22</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5000	530-Periodicals	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		\$574.20
			<i>Notes: Time for Kids</i>			
	5000	530-Periodicals	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		\$3,833.42
			<i>Notes: Scholastic News Magazine to support STEM focus</i>			
	5000	530-Periodicals	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		\$104.50
			<i>Notes: National Geographic to support STEM focus</i>			
	5000	530-Periodicals	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		\$1,097.10
			<i>Notes: Studies Weekly to support STEM focus</i>			
<b>4</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Attendance Goal</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Suspension/Behavioral Goal</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$47,473.77</b>