Gulf Gate Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Gulf Gate Elementary School

6500 S LOCKWOOD RIDGE RD, Sarasota, FL 34231

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/gulfgate

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Miller

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2005

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	58%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Gulf Gate Elementary School

6500 S LOCKWOOD RIDGE RD, Sarasota, FL 34231

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/gulfgate

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	46%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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 and instructional coaching.
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.
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.
Harting , Tammy	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.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Shinall, Nicole	Teacher, ESE	Facilitate PLC conversations and collaboration about curriculum and instructional strategies, analyze common assessments and share successful instructional strategies with the first grade team.
Gamsby , Laura	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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/20/2005, Michelle Miller

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

5

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

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	58%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students

	Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	86	102	104	118	114	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	614
Attendance below 90 percent	7	4	6	5	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	6	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Number of students 2 or more years below level in i-Ready Reading	0	3	21	15	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Number of students 2 or more years below level in i-Ready Math	0	5	28	18	23	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Number of students who participated in Summer Boost	0	0	6	10	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students participating in GEER UP!	0	0	8	9	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Number of remote students	14	21	12	25	35	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131

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	3	0	2	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/22/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	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%

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

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				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	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%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
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%	0
English Language Learners	
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%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	78
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

2019 FSA Data- 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.

Current i-Ready Data- 32% of our second graders are 2 years below level in phonics. It is also notable that 27% of our 3rd grade is 2 years below level in phonics.

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

2019 FSA Data- 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 for our ELL students who are categorized being in the lowest 25th percentile. There was a difference of 24 percentage points (from 60% (2018) to 36%).

Current i-Ready Data- In math, our overall grade level placement declined significantly from last year. Most notably, 30% of our 4th grade students are considered to be at or above grade level. Last school year, 52% of our 4th grade students were considered to be at our above grade level- for a difference of 22 percentage points. There was a decline in overall placement for all other grade levels with the exception of K and 1 (up 14 and 9 percentage points respectively).

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.

2019 FSA Data- 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 were 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?

2019 FSA Data- 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 pertinent 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?

Based on the 2019 data, 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. Social Emotional Learning for all students/Trauma Awareness- keeping a pulse on our remote learners as well as our brick and mortar students
2. School Culture- cultivating a positive school environment
3. ELA and Math instruction - primarily the learning gains of students with disabilities and our bottom quartile, additionally an intense concentration on phonics (with text applications) for grades K-2, as well as vocabulary and comprehension for grades 3-5. Specifically in math, looking at resources being utilized and instructional practice to ensure standards-based instruction and building conceptional knowledge across grade levels.
4. Attendance Awareness - also focusing on remote learners engagement
5. Science across all grade levels

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We reviewed our 2019 FSA data (75% of students across grade levels 3, 4, and 5 were considered proficient). We are hoping to minimize loss in this area and continue in an upward trajectory. From this data, our major focus areas were, and will continue to be, our students in the bottom quartile (47% demonstrated proficiency), and our ESE population, who performed the lowest of all our subgroups with 38% proficiency. These two subgroups in particular will continue to require differentiated instruction to close the learning gap. We reviewed our current i-Ready Diagnostic Data (Assessment Period 1) across grade levels K-5 and compared it to Assessment Period 1 last year at this time. Notable areas include; 9% of our second graders were considered two or more years below grade level in September of 2019, while currently (September 2020), 20% of our second graders are considered two or more years below grade level in Reading. 7% of our fourth graders were considered two or more grade levels below while this number is presently at 12%. Additionally, as indicated by this data, there is a need for direct phonics instruction (with text application) in grades K-3, and a need for direct vocabulary and comprehension instruction in grades 3,4,5. It is significant to note, 32% of our second graders and 27% of our third graders are two years below level in the domain of phonics. Due to our prior concerns, we also need to utilize i-Ready and classroom data routinely to keep a pulse on our ESE and bottom quartlie students (Report groups were created and will be monitored).
Measurable Outcome:	FSA related goals: By the year 2021: 1. 51% of the students in the lowest quartile will demonstrate proficiency in ELA as measured by the FSA. 2. The ESE student group will increase in proficiency from 38% to 42% in ELA as measured by the FSA. Additional Goals: 3. Students in grades K-3 will make significant gains in the domain of phonics which will be measured by i-Ready data (extra lessons in will be assigned after direct instruction and students will track their progress), classroom formative data, text level increase, and comparison of Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2. 4. Students in grades 3-5 will make significant gains in the domains of vocabulary and comprehension as measured by i-Ready data, classroom formative and summative data, and comparison of Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Leigh Michalojko (leigh.michalojko@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ongoing ELA PD and utilizing PLCs to collaboratively discuss students. Using our Reading Recovery teacher to provide teacher training- including training in Jan Richardson's Phonics and Word Study to address phonics deficit in grades 2 and 3. Providing resources (instructional notebook) to support vocabulary and comprehension deficit in grades 3-5.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing our ESE students access to grade level text with support at instructional level, collaboration between ESE teachers and general education teachers, verbiage on the IEP allow resource students to remain in classrooms for instruction if it would be beneficial, full time rooms are also utilized as resource rooms, present levels on IEP are derived from i-Ready (school-wide measure). Additionally, we have implemented the GEER up after-school tutorial program to support students in Grades 2-5 who are in our bottom quartile, and we are creating personalized paths on i-READY for our students on free and reduced lunch who attend after-care. According to Johan 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 bottom quartile and help close the learning gap for our ESE students. Reading Recovery and Leveled Literacy Intervention are listed on The What Works Clearinghouse as an evidenced-based program that works. Heggerty and Jan Richardson's Next Steps are also researched-based program with proven results. In order for change to happen successfully- teachers need the vision, skills, incentives, resources, and plan (Knoster, Villa and Thousand).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Providing professional development and the needed resources in for teachers to feel successful

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

2. Collaborative PLCs- Using the Striving Readers Decision Tree

Person Responsible	Leigh Michalojko (leigh.michalojko@sarasotacountyschools.net)

3. Utilization of the school-wide support team to assist in planning purposeful interventions.

Person Responsible	Teresa Morey (teresa.morey@sarasotacountyschools.net)

4. Daily intervention Block built into the schedule.

Person Responsible	Leigh Michalojko (leigh.michalojko@sarasotacountyschools.net)

5. Clear learning intentions and success criteria.

Person Responsible	Leigh Michalojko (leigh.michalojko@sarasotacountyschools.net)

7. Staff and stakeholder investment in the school vision.

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

8. Guidance in ESE best practices and resources to support students in the classroom.

Person Responsible	Margaret Seul (margaret.seul@sarasotacountyschools.net)

8. Guidance in ESE best practices and resources to support students in the classroom.

Person Responsible	Margaret Seul (margaret.seul@sarasotacountyschools.net)

8. Guidance given in ESE best practices and resources to support students in the classroom.

Person Responsible Margaret Seul (margaret.seul@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We reviewed our 2019 FSA data (73% of students across grade levels 3, 4, and 5 were considered proficient. We are hoping to minimize loss in this area and continue in an upward trajectory. From this data, our major focus areas were, and will continue to be, our students in the bottom quartile (44% demonstrated proficiency), and our ESE population performed the lowest of all our subgroups. These two subgroups in particular will continue to require additional support to close the learning gap. We reviewed our current i-Ready Diagnostic Data (Assessment Period 1) across grade levels K-5 and compared it to Assessment Period 1 last school year. Notable areas include; Our overall grade level placement has dropped in the last two years (when looking at historical trends) in all grade except for K. Grade one's overall grade level placement went up 5 percentage points last year (dropped 5 from the year before), and grade five went up 2 percentage points (dropped 18 from the year before). The greatest decline was seen in grade four- there is 22 percentage point difference from last year and a 20 percentage point difference from the year before. Additionally indicated by this data, the areas of need were equal across domains which suggests the need to look at instructional practice, resources, standards-alignment, and how we are building that conceptional knowledge. Due to our prior concerns, we also need to utilize i-Ready and classroom data routinely to keep a pulse on our ESE and bottom quartlie students (Report groups were created and will be monitored).
Measurable Outcome:	FSA related goals: By the year 2021: 1. 51% of the students in the lowest quartile will demonstrate proficiency in ELA as measured by the FSA. 2. The ESE student group will increase in proficiency from 38% to 42% in ELA as measured by the FSA. Additional Goals: 3. Students in grades K-5 will make significant gains in overall math domains which will be measured by i-Ready data (extra lessons in will be assigned after direct instruction in domain, and students will track their progress), classroom formative and summative data, and comparison of Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2. 4. Students in grades K-5 will close the gap and make progress towards their individual annual growth goal as measured by Diagnostic 2 data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robin Magac (robin.magac@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math PD, resources to supplement curriculum, standards-based instruction,classroom observations, teacher clarity in the MTSS process, utilizing PLCs to collaboratively discuss students. Providing ESE students access to grade level text with support at instructional level, collaboration between ESE teachers and general education teachers, verbiage on the IEP allow resource students to remain in classrooms for instruction if it would be beneficial, full-time rooms are also utilized as resource rooms for flexibility, present levels on IEP are

derived from i-Ready (school-wide measure).

Additionally, we have implemented the GEER up after-school program to support students in Grades 2-5 who are in our bottom quartile. The high-quality curriculum is created weekly-flexibly and specifically addressing deficit areas as determined by i-Ready and information obtained from the classroom and GEER up teachers respectively. Creating personalized paths on i-READY for our students on free and reduced lunch who attend after-care.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

According to Johan Hattie's research, teacher clarity has an effect size of .75, response to intervention has an effect size of 1.29, collective efficacy has an effect size of 1.57, and conceptual change programs has an effect size of .99. It is the hope that utilization of these research-based strategies will help us close the gap with the students who are in bottom quartile and help close the learning gap for our ESE students. Research also indicates that standards-based mathematics instruction positively supports students' academic development. Sarasota County's Maximizing Math Mentality Website provides resources and guidelines that are all aligned with best practices in mathematics, and are based on current research. Positive results were also found in tutoring programs (GEER UP) according to Best Evidence Encyclopedia.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Providing professional development and the needed resources for teachers to be successful.

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

2. Collaborative PLCS- sharing resources, unpacking the standards, and utilizing the focus guide to plan.

Person Responsible | Leigh Michalojko (leigh.michalojko@sarasotacountyschools.net)

3. Utilization of the school-wide support team to assist in planning purposeful interventions.

Person Responsible | Teresa Morey (teresa.morey@sarasotacountyschools.net)

4. Daily intervention block built into the schedule.

Person Responsible | Leigh Michalojko (leigh.michalojko@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Clear learning intentions and success criteria.

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

Staff and stakeholder investment in the school vision.

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

8. Guidance given in ESE best practices and resources to support students in the classroom.

Person Responsible | Margaret Seul (margaret.seul@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Now more than ever, social emotion learning is critical for our students. We recognize that our Gulf Gate students are coming to us with varying degree of unique and diverse needs. With social emotional learning, we are hoping to formulate and strengthen life-long skills they will carry with them to adulthood such as; self-awareness, social awareness, self-management, and responsible decision making.
Measurable Outcome:	1. 100% of our students in Grades 3-5 will participate in the 5 Star SEL curriculum. 2. 100% or our students in Grades K-2 will partake in lessons from our guidance counselor that mirror the 5 Star Curriculum. 3. Select students will participate in TIER II groups as needed Success will be measured through a decrease in suspensions and referrals as well as an increase in attendance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Teresa Morey (teresa.morey@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Direct instruction in key areas to promote social emotional learning via our guidance counselor and use of our behavioral tech (newly funded position through the ACCISS grant) to help support TIER 1 and TIER II groups. Also, part of the ACCISS grant allows us to use the support from specialist Dr. Godfrey in the following ways: o Small group Tier II group instruction for target students for set intervals o Push-in class restorative with the teachers if there is a class concern o Provide direct coaching to the behavior specialist to implement strategies trained during the behavior specialist meeting o Provide teaching coaching or PLC training
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	There is a multitude of decade long research that an education promoting social and emotional learning (SEL) gets results- including (but not limited to) academic achievement and the prevention of youth behavior problems (The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL). The 5 Star curriculum promotes growth mindset, resiliency, self regulation, leadership, and identifying and handling emotions properly.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Guidance Counselor will deliver lessons to students in grades K-5 using the 5 star curriculum.

Person Responsible	Teresa Morey (teresa.morey@sarasotacountyschools.net)

2. TIER II direct instruction in behavior as well as academics using our

Person Responsible	Leigh Michalojko (leigh.michalojko@sarasotacountyschools.net)

3. Teachers will continue to use CHAMPS, restorative strategies, PBIS, and the Civility Squad.

Person Responsible	Teresa Morey (teresa.morey@sarasotacountyschools.net)

2. TIER II direct instruction in behavior as well as academics using the supports we received from the ACCISS grant.

Person Responsible	Leigh Michalojko (leigh.michalojko@sarasotacountyschools.net)

3. Teachers will continue to use CHAMPS, restorative strategies, PBIS, and the Civility Squad.

Person Responsible	Teresa Morey (teresa.morey@sarasotacountyschools.net)

4. Referrals, suspensions, and notice of concern data will be monitored.

Person Responsible	Leigh Michalojko (leigh.michalojko@sarasotacountyschools.net)

5. Our Mental Health Therapist will continue to work with students who are at highest need.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Science - incorporating Science into the curriculum grades K-5 via the monthly calendar and using the end of the year benchmark for planning purposes; Science "Boot-camp" for grade 5 (review of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade standards), and our hands-on Science Lab.
2. Attendance Awareness - keeping a pulse on remote learners as well as brick and mortar students by using time at our school-wide support team meetings to discuss these students and take action.
3. Discipline - would like to see a decrease in referrals and suspensions through the 5 Star curriculum, CHAMPS, PBIS, and Civility Squad, Restorative Strategies, and behavior intervention groups.
4. 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.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

A positive school culture and environment is one of our top priorities this school year. Supporting and informing our students, teachers, families and community is essential. We are addressing building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved in the following ways:

Ensuring stakeholders understand and are invested in Gulf Gate's school vision though common language and teacher input in the School Improvement Plan. Grade levels are all choosing one focus area in either reading or math after reviewing our most current data-i-Ready Diagnostic 1, and will progress monitor as

part of our plan. Additional stakeholders will review and provide feedback for our School improvement Plan via SAC and PTO meetings.

Cultivating effective communication within the school by providing information in a concise and timely manner via PLC visits, team leader meetings, monthly staff meetings, and Friday Focus emails that include weekly "shout-outs" (staff and/or administration celebrating staff). Also, within the school community, communication through Facebook Posts, Connect-Ed phone messaging, group emails/texts, and individual phone calls when needed.

Providing staff support by finding out the individual needs of our teachers and then taking action. Weekly PLC were visited (and will continue to be periodically visited) by administration to discern how to best collectively and individually assist our teachers. Teacher needs are captured and then addressed in a timely manner.

Celebrating both academic and behavioral successes of our students. Continuing to utilize our Positive Behavior Support System, CHAMPS, and the Civility Squad to reinforce Gulf Gate expectations.

Holding remote family zoom meetings to further communication, answer questions, and try to cultivate connection to the school and reinforce that they are still part of the Gulf Gate Family.

Collaborating with our Business Partners to hold Gulf Gate spirit nights and brainstorming with PTO for ways to facilitate family events/nights remotely.

We are striving to find ways to show appreciate for our entire Gulf Gate family- staff, students, families, and community members that are an integral part to our success.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$5,621.35
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		$346.35
			Notes: Learning A-Z to provide a resource that provides students with instructional materials at varying text levels - aligns with Fountas & Pinnell and Reading Recovery text levels.			
	5000	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		$270.00
			Notes: Starfall to support early literacy.			
	5000		0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		$75.00
			Notes: Reading Recovery Council Membership for our Reading Recovery Teacher.			
	5000	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		$3,900.00
			Notes: IXL reading to support standards-based instruction.			

	5000	520-Textbooks	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School			$1,030.00
		Notes: The Next Step Forward in Guided Reading and supporting materials for our deficits in phonics.				
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$3,900.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		$3,900.00
		Notes: IXL Math to help support standards-based instruction.				
	5000	520-Textbooks	0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		$0.00
		Notes: Curriculum Associates MAFS Practice and Problem Solving as a supplemental resource.				
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**				**$1,400.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0271 - Gulf Gate Elementary School	General Fund		$1,400.00
		Notes: 5 STAR curriculum.				
					Total:	**$10,921.35**