Gulf Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Gulf Middle School

6419 LOUISIANA AVE, New Port Richey, FL 34653

https://gms.pasco.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Amy Riddle

Start Date for this Principal: 9/9/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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 Middle School

6419 LOUISIANA AVE, New Port Richey, FL 34653

https://gms.pasco.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

Middle School
6-8

2019-20 Title I School

Yes

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

78%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

46%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.

We aim to provide a caring and rigorous student-centered learning environment that inspires our students' journeys in becoming life-long learners who demonstrate compassion, collaboration and inter-cultural understanding.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All GMS students will be life, career and college ready.

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
Riddle, Amy	Principal	
Kledzik, Karen	Assistant Principal	
Mobley, Lori	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 9/9/2020, Amy Riddle

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
63

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	319	349	339	0	0	0	0	1007
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	60	49	0	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	61	46	0	0	0	0	129
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 in ELA or math	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	119	93	0	0	0	0	298
Course failure in ELA or math	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	52	50	0	0	0	0	182

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	0	0	0	84	75	66	0	0	0	0	225

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	369	344	343	0	0	0	0	1056
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	69	90	0	0	0	0	234
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	40	56	0	0	0	0	135
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	29	95	0	0	0	0	170
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	102	144	0	0	0	0	371

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	0	0	0	75	64	105	0	0	0	0	244

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	369	344	343	0	0	0	0	1056
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	69	90	0	0	0	0	234
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	40	56	0	0	0	0	135
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	29	95	0	0	0	0	170
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	102	144	0	0	0	0	371

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	0	0	0	75	64	105	0	0	0	0	244

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	41%	52%	54%	34%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	55%	54%	45%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	47%	47%	41%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	53%	60%	58%	43%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	57%	61%	57%	53%	58%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	52%	51%	46%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	52%	51%	38%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	51%	68%	72%	59%	70%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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**
06	2019	40%	56%	-16%	54%	-14%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	32%	51%	-19%	52%	-20%
	2018	33%	51%	-18%	51%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	42%	58%	-16%	56%	-14%
	2018	40%	58%	-18%	58%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	48%	59%	-11%	55%	-7%
	2018	43%	53%	-10%	52%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	26%	42%	-16%	54%	-28%
	2018	38%	44%	-6%	54%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
08	2019	61%	68%	-7%	46%	15%
	2018	50%	63%	-13%	45%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		23%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	41%	54%	-13%	48%	-7%
	2018	38%	53%	-15%	50%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	70%	-21%	71%	-22%
2018	53%	71%	-18%	71%	-18%
Compare		-4%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	60%	40%	61%	39%
2018	92%	63%	29%	62%	30%
Compare		8%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%

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	28	40	40	37	52	42	37	35			
ELL	16	42	41	35	56	50	7	27			

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
ASN	43	29		57	69						
BLK	26	44	40	28	44	31	29	22			
HSP	31	48	47	49	57	48	30	43	35		
MUL	40	37	40	55	60	30	53	58			
WHT	48	49	42	57	58	49	50	58	32		
FRL	39	47	45	49	55	46	41	51	29		

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	8	31	34	19	46	49	17	28			
ELL	8	39	54	21	43	36	31	20			
ASN	41	53		56	63						
BLK	20	45	45	27	56	71		40			
HSP	30	42	48	45	54	46	42	39	54		
MUL	37	46	58	60	68	50	47	67			
WHT	41	46	36	53	59	52	40	61	55		
FRL	33	42	42	46	57	51	37	50	48		

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	8	41	44	18	42	44	18	24			
ELL	12	49	40	9	32	39		53			
ASN	56	59		50	44						
BLK	20	48	50	37	45	26	32	57			
HSP	27	46	40	33	49	51	29	51	57		
MUL	35	38		48	53		53	50			
WHT	37	45	41	47	56	47	38	64	58		
FRL	31	43	40	39	52	48	34	55	64		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	28
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	50
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
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	47
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	49
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	43
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.

Our two biggest areas of concern were lowest 25% in math and social studies achievement.

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

The greatest decline was in the area of lowest 25% in math

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

The greatest gap was in the area of social studies achievement.There was not enough collaboration and PLC work within this subject as well as new teachers to the content.

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

ELA Achievement and Math Achievement both increased by 4 percent. This was in part due to the role that coaches took in these two area. The additions of priority PLCs to dive deeper into the data was a contributing factor to the increase in these two areas.

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

One area of concern is approximately 30% of our student population scored a level 1 on state assessments.

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

1. Increase intentional planning for Tier II instruction through the work of the Priority PLCs
2. Increase the use of collaboration, focused note taking and critical reading with school-wide AVID strategies.
3. Increase achievement for our subgroups identified through ESSA-Blacks, ELL and SWD.
4. Continue to focus on CFAs to allow students and teachers to track standards mastery.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiation means tailoring instruction to meet individual needs. Whether teachers differentiate content, process, products, or the learning environment, the use of ongoing assessment and flexible grouping makes this a successful approach to instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teacher will create a safe learning environment using PBIS strategies and by introducing MYP Learner Profile Attributes so at least 80% of student can self-regulate behaviors.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase in student and staff receiving PBIS reward points throughout the school year. We will see a 25% reduction in Office Discipline Referrals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Riddle (ariddle@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive Behavior Supports is a form of applied behavior analysis that uses a behavior management system to understand what maintains an individual's challenging behavior and how to change it.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase opportunities for all stakeholders to connect and build relationships with one another to increase rapport between teachers and student

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

At least 80% of teachers will routinely use WICOR focusing on structures for collaboration, inquiry, focused note taking and critical reading.

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.

At GMS we elicit feedback for several groups: School Advisory, Leadership, PTSA, Students, Staff and Community Business Partners. We are planning to start a Student Council and Principal Advisory Group to obtain more feedback from students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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