

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Gorrie Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Gorrie Elementary School

705 W DELEON ST, Tampa, FL 33606

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Marjorie Sandler**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/16/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	15%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (70%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Gorrie Elementary School

705 W DELEON ST, Tampa, FL 33606

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>17%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>32%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
<b>Grade</b>	A	A	A	A

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.**

I show....  
 Cooperation  
 Acceptance  
 Responsibility and  
 Effort  
 Because I CARE!!

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

To create and engage life-long learners from classroom to community and back.

### 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
Sandler, Marjorie	Principal	Directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of an elementary public school by performing assigned duties personally or through subordinate supervisors. Serves as the instructional leader, develops and evaluates educational program to ensure conformance of state, national and school board standards.
Kiernan, Lauren	Assistant Principal	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 6/16/2020, Marjorie Sandler

**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.*

3

**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.*

6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

40

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	15%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (70%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	79	56	82	93	99	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	516
Attendance below 90 percent	3	7	5	5	9	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

**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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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 10/28/2020

**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	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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide 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	0
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	78	81	77	94	94	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	531
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

**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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	85%	52%	57%	81%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	55%	58%	65%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	50%	53%	52%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	87%	54%	63%	86%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	80%	57%	62%	67%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	46%	51%	51%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	80%	50%	53%	82%	48%	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	87%	52%	35%	58%	29%
	2018	84%	53%	31%	57%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	87%	55%	32%	58%	29%
	2018	81%	55%	26%	56%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	78%	54%	24%	56%	22%
	2018	77%	51%	26%	55%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	84%	54%	30%	62%	22%
	2018	84%	55%	29%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	57%	32%	64%	25%
	2018	88%	57%	31%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	85%	54%	31%	60%	25%
	2018	83%	54%	29%	61%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	78%	51%	27%	53%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	79%	52%	27%	55%	24%
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	77	80	57	85						
ELL					70						
BLK	38	50		63	75	70					
HSP	74	67		74	71	57	60				
MUL	93			87							
WHT	89	69	81	90	81	63	86				
FRL	66	69	54	68	65	43	55				
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	44	53	45	59	61	55	40				
ELL	60			80							
BLK	18	30	30	33	70						
HSP	80	59	50	89	74	82	78				
MUL	94	91		88	100						
WHT	85	66	48	89	76	58	82				
FRL	56	50	29	61	68	58	36				
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	57	50	40	57	43						
BLK	8			31							
HSP	71	66	60	79	66		82				
MUL	79			93							
WHT	87	68	54	89	66	48	82				
FRL	51	61	55	67	52	55	58				

**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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
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	85
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	617
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
----------------------	--

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	68
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	78
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Native American Students</b>	
---------------------------------	--

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

<b>Asian Students</b>	
-----------------------	--

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	90
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	80
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	60
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.**

Black students in our ELA achievement- Attendance, behavior concerns attributed to lack of engagement in academics  
 Students with disabilities- extensive support required beyond VE classroom

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

All areas showed improvement

**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.**

Black students who scored a level 2 were higher than the district and state. While we have more level 2, we had less students scoring a level 1 and more students scoring levels 4 and 5.

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

The most improvement was seen in decreasing the number of students earning a level one and increasing the number in levels 2,3 and 4.

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

Attendance, Tardies and early sign outs are an area concern.

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

1. Increase the number of black students scoring a level 3 or higher
2. Increase the number of students with disabilities scoring a level 3 or higher
3. Increase percentage of average daily attendance
4. Decrease percentage of tardy children
- 5.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Teachers need to enhance alignment of specific assignment and lesson plans to meet the rigor of the standards. Classroom observations data was reviewed to identify this need.

**Measurable Outcome:** Students scoring a level 3 or higher in ELA increase from 27% to 30%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Marjorie Sandler (marjorie.sandler@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Standards based planning and guided reading groups.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Guided reading groups help teachers meet individual student needs during ELA instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Provide training on Standards Based planning for guided reading groups  
 Provide training on Best Practices for planning guided reading groups

**Person Responsible** Lauren Kiernan (lauren.kiernan@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

**#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Measurable Outcome:**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No description entered*

**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.

**Differentiation of instruction based on developmental needs and individual learning style**

**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.

The theme for the school year will be cultural diversity embracing all cultures and backgrounds. The school hosts many community involvement activities, both curriculum and social emotion driven. Examples include core curriculum nights, fall festival, drama performances, storytelling festival, reading celebration, movie nights. In school programs include, Grandparents Day, Veterans Day, Great American Teach In. Gorrie Cares promotes community partnership as well as compassion for others, Girls Leadership focus' on inner self esteem, running clubs focus on mindfulness and well being. Student Government and Embassadors build leadership, team work and community service.

**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: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>