Gadsden Elementary Magnet School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Gadsden Elementary Magnet School

200 PROVIDENCE RD, Quincy, FL 32351

www.gadsdenschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Allysun Davis
Start Date for this Principal: 10/2/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Gadsden 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

Gadsden Elementary Magnet School

200 PROVIDENCE RD, Quincy, FL 32351

www.gadsdenschools.org

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)
Combination School PK-8	No	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	99%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Gadsden 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.

It is the mission of the faculty and staff of Gadsden Elementary Magnet School to provide all children with a challenging, high-quality educational experience

Provide the school's vision statement.

To achieve our vision, we will create a rich multicultural environment for learning by designing an integrated curriculum with strong science, fine arts, and social studies components

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
Davis, Allysun	Principal	- Provide strategic direction for the staff - Develop standardized curricula - Assess teaching methods - Monitor student achievement - Encourage parent involvement - Revise policies and procedures
Porter, LaTasha	Teacher, K-12	- Plan, prepare and deliver lesson plans and instructional materials that facilitate active learning - Develop schemes of work, lesson plans and tests that are in accordance with established procedures - Instruct and monitor students - Use relevant technology to support and differentiate instruction - Encourage and monitor the progress of individual students and use information to adjust teaching strategies - Maintain accurate and complete records of students' progress and development
Lewis, Jari	Administrative Support	- Plan, prepare and deliver lesson plans and instructional materials that facilitate active learning - Develop schemes of work, lesson plans and tests that are in accordance with established procedures - Instruct and monitor students - Use relevant technology to support and differentiate instruction - Encourage and monitor the progress of individual students and use information to adjust teaching strategies - Maintain accurate and complete records of students' progress and development
Byrd, Lakysha	Other	As the School Psychologist, Ms. Byrd is responsible for the following: - Listen to concerns about academic, emotional or social problems - Help students process their problems and plan goals and action - Promote positive behaviors - Meet with parents and teachers to discuss learning, behavioral, familial and social problems - Counsel parents on topics like substance abuse and communication - Study and implement behavioral management techniques

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 10/2/2014, Allysun Davis

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
14

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Monday 9/28/2020

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	16	14	17	15	17	17	14	20	17	0	0	0	0	147
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	16	14	17	15	17	17	14	20	17	0	0	0	0	147
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	80%	50%	61%	83%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	52%	59%	73%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	55%	54%	56%	49%	51%
Math Achievement	81%	57%	62%	86%	59%	58%
Math Learning Gains	52%	52%	59%	65%	55%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	46%	52%	63%	54%	50%
Science Achievement	78%	47%	56%	84%	51%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	100%	72%	78%	0%	60%	75%

			EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**									**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	93%	37%	56%	58%	35%
	2018	88%	40%	48%	57%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	41%	26%	58%	9%
	2018	87%	38%	49%	56%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
05	2019	88%	40%	48%	56%	32%
	2018	83%	33%	50%	55%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	71%	33%	38%	54%	17%
	2018	100%	31%	69%	52%	48%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
07	2019	100%	40%	60%	52%	48%
	2018	76%	33%	43%	51%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	59%	33%	26%	56%	3%
	2018	0%	34%	-34%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		59%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	100%	55%	45%	62%	38%
	2018	94%	56%	38%	62%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	50%	22%	64%	8%
	2018	93%	49%	44%	62%	31%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
05	2019	88%	49%	39%	60%	28%
	2018	100%	48%	52%	61%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
06	2019	79%	48%	31%	55%	24%
	2018	100%	49%	51%	52%	48%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
07	2019	95%	52%	43%	54%	41%
	2018	82%	40%	42%	54%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	65%	30%	35%	53%	12%
	2018	50%	30%	20%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	57%	37%	67%	27%
2018	0%	34%	-34%	65%	-65%
Compare		94%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	60%	40%	71%	29%
2018	88%	55%	33%	71%	17%
Compare		12%			

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	53%	34%	19%	61%	-8%
2018	0%	30%	-30%	62%	-62%
Compare		53%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	20%	-20%	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
BLK	77	45	50	77	48	36	80	100	93		
HSP	86	68		90	58						
FRL	79	53	58	79	52	47	79	100	93		
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
BLK	83	60	65	90	65	58	67	81			
HSP	94	77		94	77						
FRL	88	65	73	95	61		75				
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
BLK	79	71	50	85	61	62	78				
FRL	88	77		92	67		89				

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	71

ESSA Federal Index	
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	639
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	67
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	76
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	71
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.

Data analysis of the 2019 FSA math results show that 45% of the lowest 25th percentile made learning gains in math. Although our overall math performance was 81%, many students who scored at levels 4 and 5 in 2018, did not maintain those accelerated levels in 2019. This resulted in a decrease in the number of students making learning gains in 2019.

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

The greatest decline in student performance, as indicated by the 2019 assessment results, is the number of students in the lowest 25th percentile in mathematics. Assessment results indicate that 13% of the tested population failed to maintain or exceed their prior year scores.

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.

Assessment results indicate large gaps in the performance of Gadsden Elementary Magnet School and the state in two areas; Social Studies and Science. In both areas, Gadsden Elem. Magnet's performance exceeded the results of the state by 22 points.

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

When comparing the assessment results from 2018 to 2019, results show the largest percentage of improvement occurred in Social Studies with a 17% gain in the number of students scoring at or above Level 3 on the Civic EOC exam.

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

Based on the EWS data, we will work to (1) reduce the number of students with more than one data point in the EWS, (2) reduce the number of students scoring Level 1 and (3) reduce the number of suspensions.

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

1. Increasing the number of students making learning gains in Reading
2. Increasing the number of students making learning gains in Math
3. Maintaining proficiency levels of students moving from 3rd to 4th grade
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:
No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Although our EWS report shows less than five students scoring Level 1 on the 2019 Reading FSA, our goal is to reduce this number to 0. In an effort to ensure this takes place, student data will be analyzed weekly to provide support in weak areas and enrichment in areas of strength. Students will also be referred to the school's Resource teacher for added support.

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.

Creating and maintaining a positive school environment is an essential component of the school program. Teachers and staff regularly compliment students for making good choices and for exhibiting leadership skills. Students are encouraged to bring innovative ideas to the administration, their teachers, or the the Student Council.
GEMS regularly highlights student achievements by:
- placing names on the school's marquee
- featuring individual and groups of students on the school's webpage
- using Skylert to inform parents of the great things that are happening at school
- teachers will host virtual celebrations to include remote learners
- Teachers & parents will be recognized each month

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.

Total:	**$0.00**