

The School District of Lee County

# Gateway 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>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Gateway Elementary School

13280 GRIFFIN DR, Fort Myers, FL 33913

<http://gty.leeschools.net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Cherry Gibson**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2012

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	99%
<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* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (52%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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 Lee 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>23</b>

## Gateway Elementary School

13280 GRIFFIN DR, Fort Myers, FL 33913

<http://gty.leeschools.net/>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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 will lead with greatness and become contributing members of the global community.

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

To create the leaders of tomorrow.

### 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
Torres, Mirta	Principal	Provide instructional leadership at Gateway Elementary School that will ensure continuous improvement in measurable student performance and achievement. Provide organizational leadership to include personnel, budget, purchasing, safety, public relations, plant operations, food services, and transportation that will support high performance expectations for all stakeholders.
Torres, Mirta	Assistant Principal	Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process in your building <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development</li> <li>• Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible</li> <li>• Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process</li> <li>• Conduct classroom Walkthroughs to monitor fidelity</li> </ul>

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 7/2/2012, Cherry Gibson

**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.*

1

**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.*

4

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

37

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	99%
<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* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (52%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* 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	120	119	113	132	149	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	731
Attendance below 90 percent	5	7	6	8	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	2	15	12	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	5	7	9	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

**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	2	8	11	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

**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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Saturday 10/24/2020

**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	
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	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	
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	60%	57%	57%	68%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	56%	58%	61%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	50%	53%	48%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	73%	62%	63%	69%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	65%	62%	53%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	54%	51%	39%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	52%	53%	49%	51%	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	61%	58%	3%	58%	3%
	2018	68%	55%	13%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	55%	-1%	58%	-4%
	2018	62%	53%	9%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
	2018	56%	52%	4%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	61%	6%	62%	5%
	2018	73%	58%	15%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	62%	8%	64%	6%
	2018	65%	58%	7%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	72%	58%	14%	60%	12%
	2018	47%	57%	-10%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	50%	4%	53%	1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	56%	52%	4%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	21	36	36	35	61	58	29				
ELL	31	29		44	71						
BLK	40	33	25	57	67	61	30				
HSP	53	57	45	70	77	54	51				
MUL	86	50		86	83						
WHT	77	65	23	85	77	50	72				
FRL	44	42	30	64	70	56	38				
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	18	33	33	22	25	19	25				
ELL	22	33	31	39	40	30					
BLK	48	60	28	44	24	12	46				
HSP	60	55	43	59	40	34	46				
MUL	84	58		74	50						
WHT	73	52	30	75	50	18	75				
FRL	56	52	39	53	34	23	49				
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	32	52	42	36	39	28	29				
ELL	30	44	36	43	56	40					
BLK	62	67	50	58	58	44	38				
HSP	56	52	42	62	48	26	42				
MUL	86	70		86	70						
WHT	81	65	67	80	54	53	57				
FRL	54	57	43	56	51	34	37				

### 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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	448
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
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	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
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	56
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	76
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
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 lowest performing area is ELA Lowest 25%. Teachers reported students struggled throughout the school year with stamina. The skills needed to take information from multiple sources to draw conclusions, make inferences, or apply other higher level thinking skills to their reading. Building stamina and providing opportunities for students to practice using higher level thinking skills to multiple reading passages is a focus for us this year.

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

ELA declined 4 percentage points in both proficiency and lowest 25%. Last year we had an increase in new students to our school in grades 3, 4, 5 who entered with reading substantial below grade level. Teachers reported students struggled with stamina and higher level comprehension skills, especially with multiple passages.

**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.**

Gateway Elementary's ELA Lowest 25% results demonstrated the greatest gap as compared to the state average. Gateway Elementary's ELA Lowest 25% is 32% as compared to the state average of 53%. The factors that contributed to this gap is noted in the above answers.

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

Gateway Elementary scores showed the most improvement in Math. Math Proficiency, Math Learning Gains, and Math Lowest 25% gains all increased significantly as compared to our 17-18 scores as well as State/District scores. During the 18-19 school year, we increased our Math instructional times across all grade levels and used I-Ready Progress monitoring data to focus interventions on math gaps students had in their Math skills.

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

The increase in new to Gateway students in grades 4 and 5 contributed to the lack of progress in ELA L25%. Our teachers were able to adapt the use of Progress Monitoring data from I-Ready to increase our Math scores, however, we need to work with teachers to use our data to provide focused interventions in ELA to fill in reading gaps.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains
2. ELA Proficiency
3. ELA Learning Gains
4. Science Proficiency
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	18-19 school year ELA proficiency scores declined 4 percentage points (from 64 - 60%) as compared to 17-18 school year.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Gateway Elementary students will increase ELA scores from 60% to 67% by May 2020 as measure by 2020 FSA ELA Assessment.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Mirta Torres (chrisms@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Gateway Elementary teachers will use Curriculum maps, Instructional Guides, and High Yield Strategies to increase experiences for students to expand their stamina and develop thinking skills around the materials they read. Our coaching specialist will work with teachers to clearly and effectively utilize every minute of the ELA instructional time. High Yield Strategies such as Distributed Summarizing, Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs and Higher Order Thinking, are research based strategies that will aid students in developing oral communication, and increase reading comprehension by analyzing and writing about the content.</p> <p>In addition, teachers will analyze I-Ready data to determine student growth and determine interventions that are prescriptive based. Through grade levels data chats and PLCs, best practices are discussed and shared among teachers to meet the needs of all students through interventions, modifications and differentiated instruction.</p> <p>Teachers report the stamina struggle of students to maintain focus when presented with multiple passages and student lack of grade level reading skills. I-Ready progress monitoring data identified skills gaps and below grade level reading performance. The evidence-based High Yield Strategies selected, Higher Order Thinking, Distributed Summarizing, and Numbered Head Collaborative Pairs, provide a specific focus for lessons, and they exhibit an upward movement that progresses through the levels of learning. The rationale for selecting these evidence-based High Yield Strategies is the effect size that they have on students (.85 through 1.61). Distributive Summarizing helps students process their new learning throughout the lesson and provides teachers with evidence of student achievement. Collaborative Pairs strategies stimulate retention of new information and promote student engagement through participation. These strategies are utilized during whole group and small group instruction, and they can be adapted to meet the needs of each student.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. I-Ready Progress Monitoring Data Analysis
2. Administration review of the use of instructional time within the 90 minute reading block
3. Use I-Ready resources to develop prescriptive interventions to close the identified skills gaps.
4. Focus on increasing stamina reading activities for all students using complex reading materials in differentiated groups, include fluency activities.
5. Provide training to K-5 teachers on effective implementation of High Yield Strategies- Distributed Summarizing, Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs and Higher Order Thinking Strategies.
6. Conduct focused area walkthroughs to monitor efficient implementation of these strategies during whole and small group instruction, with focus on Students with Disabilities.
7. Provide teachers feedback and additional support through additional training and/or modeling if needed
8. Students in the Lowest 25%, including Students with Disabilities, pulled during intervention time into



smaller groups to be provided prescriptive interventions based on the skills identified in I-Ready Progress Monitoring.

**Person Responsible** Mirta Torres (chrisms@leeschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	18-19 school year ELA learning gain scores remained the same as compared to 17-18 school year
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Gateway Elementary students will increase ELA Learning Gain scores from 54% to 57% by May 2020 as measure by 2020 FSA ELA Assessment.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Mirta Torres (chrisms@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Gateway Elementary teachers will use Curriculum maps, Instructional Guides, and High Yield Strategies, Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs, Higher Order Thinking and Distributed Summarizing, to increase experiences for students to expand their stamina and develop thinking skills around the materials they read. The use of instructional time will be clearly and effectively utilized by our teachers through a defined plan created with the support of our Coach Specialist. Data collected through i-Ready and other formative and summative assessments will be discussed during PLCs, and will determined the academic instruction to be delivered during 90 minutes of ELA instruction based on student academic growth. Data based discussions will include research-based instructional strategies to intervene, modify and differentiate instruction during whole and small group instruction. Intervention time will include extended activities to help students scoring at Level 4 and 5 to maintain or increase their achievement levels.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Teachers report the stamina struggle of students to maintain focus when presented with multiple passages and student lack of grade level reading skills. I-Ready progress monitoring data identified skills gaps and below grade level reading performance. The High Yield Strategies selected exhibit an upward movement that will show progress through the DOK levels of learning required based on the standards. These strategies in conjunction with other strategies such as vocabulary, reading comprehension, writing to raise the achievement, concept maps and graphic organizers during whole and small group instruction will increase students stamina, engagement and comprehension. Data analysis will focus on ESSA subgroups learning gains for on level, below and above grade level students to determine the rigor of instruction required by the standards to close the academic gaps. The ongoing progress monitoring and data analysis will determine the future implementation of strategies, length and intensity to increase learning gains.</p>

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. I-Ready Progress Monitoring Data Analysis
2. Administration review of the use of instructional time within the 90 minute reading block
3. Monitor learning gains throughout the year. Use I-Ready resources to develop prescriptive interventions to close the identified skills gaps. Include focus on Students with disabilities and their area of need.
4. Data chats with individual teachers as well as grade level data chats during PLC meetings
5. Focus on increasing stamina reading activities for all students using complex reading materials that will accelerate student academic learning in differentiated groups.
6. 45 minute Daily Intervention block focused on specific interventions based on I-Ready data, district formative assessments and other assessments ( school formative and summative).
7. Conduct focused area walkthroughs to monitor efficient implementation of these strategies during whole and small group instruction.
8. Provide teachers feedback and additional support through additional training and/or modeling if needed

9. Continue fluency activities to increase fluency skills and comprehension.

10. Include/continue incorporating additional High Yield Strategies during instruction such as vocabulary instruction, reading comprehension, writing to raise the achievement, advanced organizers, concept maps formative assessment, direct and small group instruction, and scaffolding.

**Person**  
**Responsible** Mirta Torres (chrisms@leeschools.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Gateway Elementary cannot maintain it's B School Grade or increase our school grade to an A until we increase the Learning gains for our Lowest 25% students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Gateway Elementary students will increase ELA Learning Gain scores for Lowest 25% from 32% to 50% by May 2020 as measure by 2020 FSA ELA Assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Mirta Torres (chrisms@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Gateway teachers will use I-Ready Progress Monitoring data to increase prescriptive interventions for our lowest 25% student population. Our coaching specialist will work with teachers to clearly and effectively define the way teachers and students utilize their 45 minutes daily intervention block to close the academic ELA gaps, and increase their reading and writing level of performance.

Gateway Elementary teachers will use Curriculum Maps, Instructional Guides, and High Yield Strategies to increase experiences for students to expand their stamina and develop thinking skills around the materials they read. Our coaching specialist will work with teachers to clearly and effectively utilize every minute of the ELA instructional time. High Yield Strategies such as Distributed Summarizing, Numbered Heads Collaborative Pairs and Higher Order Thinking, are research based strategies that will aid the lowest 25% students population in developing oral communication, and increase reading comprehension by analyzing and writing about the content.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Teachers report the students in the Lowest 25% struggle to read grade level materials effectively. Students lack stamina and fluency to help maintain focus when presented with multiple passages. Student lack of grade level reading skills and effective strategies to use with multisyllabic words. I-Ready progress monitoring data will identify skills gaps and below grade level reading performance for teachers to differentiate and meet student needs. The evidence-based High Yield Strategies selected, Higher Order Thinking, Distributed Summarizing, and Numbered Head Collaborative Pairs exhibit an upward movement that progresses through the levels of learning. The rationale for selecting these evidence-based High Yield Strategies is the effect size that they have on students. Distributive Summarizing helps students process their new learning throughout the lesson, Collaborative Pairs strategies stimulate retention of new information and promote student engagement through participation. These research based strategies will close the gaps of the lowest 25% student population.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. I-Ready Progress Monitoring Data Analysis to identify the learning gaps
2. Administration review of the use of instructional time during the intervention block
3. Monitor learning gains throughout the year. Use I-Ready resources to develop prescriptive interventions to close the identified skills gaps.
4. Data chats with individual teachers as well as grade level data chats during PLC meetings
5. Focus on increasing stamina reading activities for all students using complex reading materials that will accelerate student academic learning in differentiated groups.
6. 45 minute Daily Intervention block focused on specific interventions based on I-Ready data, district formative assessments and other assessments ( school formative and summative).

7. Small group intervention by Coaches for Students in Lowest 25% and Students with Disabilities
7. Conduct focused area walkthroughs to monitor efficient implementation of these strategies during whole and small group instruction.
8. Provide teachers feedback and additional support through additional training and/or modeling if needed
9. Implement fluency activities to increase student fluency skills
10. Include/continue incorporating additional High Yield Strategies during instruction such as vocabulary instruction, reading comprehension, writing to raise the achievement, advanced organizers, concept maps formative assessment, direct and small group instruction, and scaffolding.

**Person Responsible** Mirta Torres (chrisms@leeschools.net)

#### #4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the Early Warning System 65 out of 143 students in grades 3, 4, 5 have 10% or more absences.

**Measurable Outcome:** By June 2019, 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders in the Early Warning System will reduce excessive absences of 10% or more from 45% to 35%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Mirta Torres (chrisms@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Our Social Worker and School Counselor will work with families and students to encourage regular school attendance. Connecting students with caring adults at the school to make connections and build relationships will encourage regular attendance.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Building relationships and making connections with students encourages regular school attendance and increase student achievement.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Social Worker and Information Specialist work together to check attendance for each students in our targeted student group.
2. Social Worker will make home phone calls/visits to assist families and encourage regular attendance.
3. Special area teachers and other adults in the school will be connected with specific students for daily check in time.
4. School Counselor will include students in small group time and individual counseling time as needed
5. As appropriate by grade level, a peer buddy will be assigned in class for checking in to encourage attendance.
6. Teachers greet students at the door each morning to welcome students to our school.
7. Teachers will make positive phone calls to parents to make connections and build relationships.

**Person Responsible** Mirta Torres (chrisms@leeschools.net)

## #5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Gateway Elementary referrals have been trending down since 2017. Gateway Elementary OSS referrals have also been trending downward since 2017.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By June 2019, Gateway Elementary will reduce the number of student referrals by 10% as compared to 18-19 school year.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Mirta Torres (chrisms@leeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Building relationships with students and developing connections empowers students to feel connected and an important part of our school community. Gateway uses "Leader in Me" to empower students to be leaders of themselves and others using the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People. Students create class mission statements and 'find the leader in themselves'. Every student has a Leadership Notebooks to create goals, track progress, and celebrate their accomplishments.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Students that can regulate their emotions, get along with others, and focus on academics increase their academic achievement in school.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement programs for all tier 2 and tier 3 students with behavioral incentive point sheets with goals based on individual student needs, serviced by guidance counselor, MTSS intervention specialist and Administration.
2. School Counselor will identify and work with students affected by trauma.
3. School Counselor will identify students with anger issues and work with Intervention Specialist to create SIP plans to help students regulate their emotions.
4. School Counselor will work with small groups of students with anger issues using Zones of Regulation.
5. Grade levels create behavior incentive procedures to reward students working towards their goals.

**Person Responsible** Mirta Torres (chrisms@leeschools.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**Gateway Elementary Leadership Team has systems in place to monitor student progress, intervention practices, and student performance. These systems include quarterly data chats with individual teachers, analysis of lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, coaching/modeling of instructional practices, and PLC discussions to answer the 4 critical PLC questions.**

## 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.

Gateway Elementary uses many opportunities to build positive relationships with parents, families, and our community. We start off the year with an Open House to invite families and students the opportunity to become familiar with our campus and meet their teacher for the upcoming school year. Our School Advisory Committee invites all families, staff, and community members interested in joining SAC to the August SAC meeting. SAC membership reflects our demographics and provides us the opportunity to seek input from families. The Principal presents a draft of the SIP, gathers input from SAC attendees, and seeks SAC approval of the SIP. During the first quarter, all teachers are required to conference with the families of all students. In January, our families are invited to attend our schoolwide Student-Led Conferences event. In addition, 4 times per year (once each quarter), administrators open the Media Center on a Saturday and invite students/families to Family Reading Time. STEM night is held in November. STEM night invites our students and families to participate in interactive, hands-on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math activities. All interactive activities have a take home component. Science Fair/Inventor's Fair Parent Night is an opportunity for students to share their Science Fair and Inventor's Fair projects with families. Every Spring, our school hosts a Spring Fair. This annual event attracts students, families, our community, and alumni to Gateway to connect and interact in fun outdoor activities. Our end of year wraps up with our school wide Leadership Day. Leadership Day is the opportunity for students to demonstrate the leadership growth they have made this year and how they implement the 7 Habits of Highly Effective kids in their daily life. This popular event is attended by families, community members, businesses, school board members, and other schools.

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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

### **Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>