

Manatee County Public Schools

B.D. Gullett Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

B.D. Gullett Elementary School

12125 44TH AVE E, Bradenton, FL 34211

<https://www.manateeschools.net/gullett>

Demographics

Principal: Todd Richardson

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2020

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)	21%
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: A (69%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (61%)
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 Manatee 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

B.D. Gullett Elementary School

12125 44TH AVE E, Bradenton, FL 34211

<https://www.manateeschools.net/gullett>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">18%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">30%</p>

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 Manatee 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 B. D. Gullett Elementary School is to inspire all learners to dream, achieve, and develop a love of learning through curiosity, commitment, and compassion.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Gullett Elementary is for each student to achieve full potential in his or her academic, creative, personal, physical, moral and spiritual development.

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
Richardson, Todd	Principal	
Carter, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
Schroer, Toni	Assistant Principal	
Gierhart, Julie	Administrative Support	
McCaw, Lauren	Administrative Support	
Killian, Kathryn	Dean	
Pfeiffer, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	
Bock, Sarah	Teacher, ESE	
Barnes, Brittani	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/12/2020, Todd Richardson

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.*

53

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

73

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)	21%
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: A (69%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (61%)
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	129	196	164	201	203	176	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1069
Attendance below 90 percent	13	8	9	10	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	7	1	2	5	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	16	15	17	11	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Course failure in Math	0	1	10	13	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	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	1	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

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	161	160	184	213	184	171	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1073
Attendance below 90 percent	11	4	5	6	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	1	8	7	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	12	13	12	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	18	19	14	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	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	161	160	184	213	184	171	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1073
Attendance below 90 percent	11	4	5	6	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	1	8	7	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	12	13	12	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	18	19	14	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	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	76%	52%	57%	72%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	57%	58%	65%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	55%	53%	58%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	80%	63%	63%	71%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	73%	68%	62%	66%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	53%	51%	51%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	74%	48%	53%	69%	42%	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	73%	51%	22%	58%	15%
	2018	79%	49%	30%	57%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	56%	19%	58%	17%
	2018	74%	51%	23%	56%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	75%	52%	23%	56%	19%
	2018	78%	52%	26%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	60%	22%	62%	20%
	2018	70%	56%	14%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	65%	13%	64%	14%
	2018	79%	61%	18%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	76%	60%	16%	60%	16%
	2018	80%	58%	22%	61%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	71%	48%	23%	53%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	72%	49%	23%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	43	46	47	44	51	65	65				
ELL	51	55	52	58	68	53	47				
ASN	89	56		83	75						
BLK	52	68	67	52	59	42	60				
HSP	63	56	56	67	71	57	55				
MUL	72	69		79	75						
WHT	81	70	55	86	75	63	84				
FRL	61	63	59	62	63	50	58				
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	63	67	65	57	70	58					
ELL	59	67	64	68	67						
ASN	88			81							
BLK	45	60	73	49	65	75	50				
HSP	66	60	57	71	66	43	61				
MUL	95	77		75	54						
WHT	86	70	62	86	84	76	78				
FRL	64	55	60	65	65	55	68				
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	35	61	64	40	63	57	57				
ELL	30	63	71	48	63	67					
BLK	52	65	60	52	47						
HSP	63	73	67	67	66	43	56				
MUL	65	60		53	60						
WHT	78	63	58	76	69	59	75				
FRL	55	59	53	57	62	40	53				

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	68
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	547
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
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	56
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	76
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	57
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	61

Hispanic Students	
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	74
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	73
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	59
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 data component that showed the lowest performance was in our Learning Gains categories. In this we have our lowest quartile learning gains, as well as our students scoring 4's and 5's who have to be considered in this category. Both groups need small group differentiation addressing both students who are not at proficiency as well as students who are above level. All groups need to be differentiated. We also noticed that our students with disabilities were showing 43% proficiency in ELA. Another factor to consider while we reflect over our data is that our student population is changing due to redistricting. Many of the students in our lowest quartile in 2019 are now redistricted to Bashaw Elementary.

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 our lowest quartile learning gains for both ELA and Math. Attendance was a big factor for our lowest quartile students. There were also behavior concerns of the lowest quartile. Engagement during class and motivation to learn has been a concern throughout all grade levels. Many of our students in the lowest quartile tended to show signs of having a fixed mind set. Students' perception of themselves effects their willingness to be open to new learning. Many of our lowest quartile students were less willing to take risks in class and with their learning. Through differentiation, we believe that our students could learn to persevere when tasks are difficult.

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 decline was in our lowest quartile learning gains for both ELA and Math. Attendance was a big factor for our lowest quartile students. There were also behavior concerns of the lowest quartile. Engagement during class and motivation to learn has been a concern throughout all grade levels. Many of our students in the lowest quartile tended to show signs of having a fixed mind set. Students' perception of themselves effects their willingness to be open to new learning. Many of our lowest quartile students were less willing to take risks in class and with their learning. By building student capacity to persevere and gain confidence in their actions, we believe the students will be able to perform better. Another factor to consider while we reflect over our data is that our student population is changing due to redistricting. Many of the students in our lowest quartile in 2019 are now redistricted to Bashaw Elementary.

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

Our Math Achievement Proficiency increased from 79% to 80% proficient. We implemented the MAFS curriculum. We also used heterogeneous math grouping in third grade classrooms, where as in the past homogeneous grouping was implemented. This grade level showed the greatest gains. There was an emphasis throughout the school to use more differentiated small groups during Math instruction after a whole group introduction to the standard being taught. We offered teachers professional development in small group math instruction. Teachers discussed and shared this vertically among teams. This is a continued goal for our school.

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

Our potential areas of concern are increasing learning gains in both reading and math and developing students socially and emotionally. We continue due to the pandemic to have concerns over attendance. We noticed that our number of absences increased last year. We feel that much of this was due to the pandemic and students reverting to eLearning for the last quarter. We suspect that we will have similar results this year with the attendance issues due to the increased safety precautions in place this year.

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

1. Social Emotional Growth of students
2. Learning Gains in ELA (especially students with disabilities)
3. Learning Gains in Math (especially students with disabilities)
4. Learning Gains of Lowest 25% in ELA (especially students with disabilities)
5. Learning Gains of Lowest 25% in Math (especially students with disabilities)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Students have been eLearning instead of brick and mortar all of Quarter 4 at the end of the 19-20 school year. . The return to brick and mortar this fall (20-21) has been met with mixed opinions from our families. We currently have 400 students who have opted for Hybrid and eLearning models of instructional delivery at the beginning of the year. As the year progresses we anticipate more and more families returning to brick and mortar. Our students, their families, and our staff have all had to They therefore will need to reacclimate to a new way of living due to the global pandemic both at school and away from school. Current nationwide data is indicating an increase in suicide rates, including in our youth. Research indicates that as our students are in an environment where they feel comfortable and have a sense of belonging, they will be more likely to persevere in their learning and have increased social behavior. We noted a slight decrease in Office Discipline Referral data last school year. However students were present for 3 quarters instead of all 4 quarters as in the previous year. This data indicates a need to continue to focus on our Social Emotional Learning Environment.

Measurable Outcome:

To measure the success of our outcomes, we will create a Social Emotional climate survey in Microsoft Forms for all of our students. This will be given to students in October and again in May. We will compare the data to measure the success of our plans. We will also continue to use Office Discipline data for the year as a measure.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Toni Schroer (schroert@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Provide staff with opportunities for Professional Development and tools to build relationships with their students and to identify warning signs that students are struggling with trauma. Students who are showing escalated signs of trauma or struggling to cope will be referred to the guidance counselors for assistance. Guidance Counselors will also be available to schedule lessons that are specific to whole class, small group, or individual needs based on the outcomes of the student survey and teacher observation. Participate in meetings and surveys provided by the school district and Character Strong.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Last year we began the implementation of Morning Meetings. This year we have added a professional development component designed through Schoology using materials compiled from various resources to assist teachers in building relationships with students and developing preventative strategies to assist students with coping. In addition, due to the global pandemic, the school district is also beginning the implementation of Character Strong. Our school counselors will be participating in various meetings using this curriculum.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue Morning Meetings in the classroom.
2. Analyze teacher observations to determine small group and individual intervention needs.

Person Responsible

Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

3. Monitor and assign the Schoology PD Course entitled: Building Positive Relationships.

Person Responsible

Toni Schroer (schroert@manateeschools.net)

4. Assign the SEL survey to students.

Person Responsible Toni Schroer (schroert@manateeschools.net)

5. Analyze the results of the SEL survey to determine whole class, small group, or individual interventions.

Person Responsible Kathryn Killian (killiank@manateeschools.net)

6. Plan and deliver lessons to address specific needs as determined through teacher observation, survey results, and ODR data.

Person Responsible Todd Richardson (richardt@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Effective instructional practice is an important avenue to learning gains. We notice that one critical area of need is to focus on our learning gains in ELA and Math. Differentiation of instruction for students is key to meeting the needs of the students at different times. By using current formative data collected by teachers, the needs of individual students and whole class can be measured to determine instructional pathways in all subject areas. Teachers can use the data to determine the next steps for whole group instruction as well as forming flexible small groups to preview new learning, reteach information, accelerate instruction, or provide an avenue for continued practice with current learning. Small group instruction garners a 0.49 effect size on student learning when the groups are flexible instead of fixed, and are formed based on data that points to student need (Fisher, Frey, and Hattie, 2016). Therefore our staff will rely on differentiation to ensure that students meet proficiency in ELA and Math, and also make learning gains. According to our data from 2019, there is a need to ensure that our learning gains increase. Our current lowest quartile of students in both ELA and Math include students who met proficiency according to the 2019 FSA. Differentiation of instruction will be an important key to the success of our school.

Measurable Outcome:

We will use a variety of quantitative data tools to measure the success of our plan in meeting a successful outcome. This data will be collected quarterly (Benchmark assessments), triannually (iReady, Jan Richardson Assessment), and annually (FSA).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Toni Schroer (schroert@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will use a variety of quantitative data tools to determine the instructional needs of the students. This formative data will be collected in a variety of ways. Our teachers will administer quarterly benchmark assessments provided by Manatee County School District based on the standards taught during the quarter in both ELA and Math. Triannually iReady and Jan Richardson Assessments will be administered. Teachers will flexibly group students to meet the different needs of the students based on this data. Teachers will also use the data to determine the learning pathways using supplemental resources or district provided resources. This differentiation might be whole group or small group dependent upon student needs. Gullett Elementary also follows the ESE inclusion model which is an integral part of how Gullett demonstrates how each students' needs are met.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Teaching is based on forming hypotheses about learners and then determining a pathway that best fits the learner (Marzano, 2001). Knowing that not all learners are the same is a fundamental factor to teaching and learning. Differentiation of instruction ensures that students will be receiving the right instruction at the right time. Using on-going data collection is instrumental in forming these hypotheses to better support learners. The resources we used to select this strategy is based on the work of researchers such as Jan Richardson, Fountas and Pinnell, Marzano, Fisher, Frey, and Hattie, among others. Gullett Elementary also follows the ESE inclusion model which is an integral part of how Gullett demonstrates how each students' needs are met. Gullett strives to educate each and every student based on their differing needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create professional development opportunities for teachers to support differentiated instruction in ELA and Math in Schoology. (ELA focus on guided reading instruction in 3 steps from assessment, design, and implementation. Math focus on Math in Practice and Acaletics.)

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

2. Deliver in person follow up PD after the teachers have completed the virtual PD for ELA.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

3. Deliver on-going PD and data analysis for Acaletics implementation in grades 4-5.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

4. Plan and conduct data meetings to analyze data for tiered interventions.

Person Responsible Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

5. Plan grade level opportunities for data driven instructional planning quarterly.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

6. Offer coaching cycles and modeling for teachers to improve differentiated instruction efficacy based on teacher observation information.

Person Responsible Toni Schroer (schroert@manateeschools.net)

7. Develop coaching cycles with teachers to improve differentiated instruction efficacy.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

8. Attempt to group all ESE students into identified inclusion classrooms. Flood ESE support into these classrooms to ensure differentiation.

Person Responsible Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

9. Provide support for teachers on collecting data onto spreadsheets to use for planning purposes. Teachers will use School City as a data collection resource for iReady, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, and Jan Richardson Data. (4th & 5th grade Acaletics Math data).

Person Responsible Toni Schroer (schroert@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will monitor a variety of assessment data as it becomes available from multiple angles. This includes a focus on grade level data, classroom data, and individual student data for trends and growth of students. Our analysis of our data indicated that we will need to ensure that students are showing learning gains, especially with our ESE students and our Lowest Quartile.

The leadership team will monitor grade level data to determine which standards grade level-wide may need extra attention or review. This data will be analyzed to determine which standards are met with great accuracy. We will also monitor to problem solve why items may have been marked incorrectly by students in order to clear up any misconceptions.

Further information will be gathered by individual classrooms. Administration will intervene with teachers who may need additional support if the majority of the class has identifiable gaps in attaining standards performance. Individual teachers will be offered opportunities for PD based on their instructional needs in order to differentiate their instruction for the entire class. A determination will also be made if a Coaching cycle needs to be offered.

Individual student scores will also be monitored by the classroom teacher as well as administration in order to offer differentiated support for students. Individual students, who are not making appropriate learning gains according to the data, may be identified to receive Tier 2 or Tier 3 supports through the MTSS process. Parents will be included as partners for individual students.

Administration will divide the lowest quartile students to build relationships with and act as a cheerleader to support these students. This extra layer of support for our lowest quartile students will be provided weekly in a variety of ways. This might include goal setting, lunch buddy, or other ways to celebrate student success dependent on the student's motivator preferences.

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 Gullett Elementary we believe that communication and collaboration is the key to building a supportive and appreciative environment in which to work and learn. Our goal is to involve all stakeholders in data driven decision-making to benefit the school as a whole. Our staff was invited to volunteer to assist in the

writing of our School Improvement Plan. All staff is involved in the implementation of the plan. Professional Development for all of our staff is available through Schoology this year to meet the challenges of meeting the needs of all staff virtually and in person. Teachers will write their PDP goals to align with our SIP goals.

Each year we hold elections for our SAC board and have always in the past had well attended SAC meetings. Traditionally our SAC board has worked hard to hear the voices of the community. They bring the perspectives and viewpoints to our SAC meetings so that as a school community we are able to work together to solve issues and concerns. Our SAC will also be involved in the approval of the SIP for our school. Our PTO is also involved in ensuring the successful implementation of our SIP through raising funds to purchase necessary supplements to our curriculum and learning environment.

The same philosophy of teamwork holds true for our staff. We strive to provide timely communication to our staff of current trends using both qualitative and quantitative data. Our instructional leadership team collaborates with our administrative team to assist in decision making and communication. Our administrative team is readily available and transparent with all stakeholders. Our culture is one of collaboration and trust.

Grade levels meet monthly to review current academic data and discuss interventions to meet the individual needs of students. Our MTSS team meets each Tuesday to ensure that individual students are receiving appropriate interventions to help them grow academically and socially.

Overall with the challenges we have faced in opening this school year, the staff, students, and their families have provided a supportive environment focused on the health and safety of all. Our staff and families have truly bonded together to ensure a culture of appreciation and success at Gullett.

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00