

Pasco County Schools

Gulf Middle School



2021-22 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	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Gulf Middle School

6419 LOUISIANA AVE, New Port Richey, FL 34653

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

Demographics

Principal: Amy Riddle

Start Date for this Principal: 6/22/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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	0

Gulf Middle School

6419 LOUISIANA AVE, New Port Richey, FL 34653

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	80%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Moore, Hope	Instructional Coach	
Fox, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	
Tuttle, Carla	Instructional Coach	
Kledzik, Karen	Assistant Principal	
Mobley, Lori	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 6/22/2019, Amy Riddle

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

966

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/16/2021

2020-21 - 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	319	349	339	0	0	0	0	1007
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	60	49	0	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	61	46	0	0	0	0	129
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 in ELA or math	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	119	93	0	0	0	0	298
Course failure in ELA or math	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	52	50	0	0	0	0	182

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	75	66	0	0	0	0	225

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	319	349	339	0	0	0	0	1007
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	60	49	0	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	61	46	0	0	0	0	129
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 in ELA or math	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	119	93	0	0	0	0	298
Course failure in ELA or math	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	52	50	0	0	0	0	182

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	75	66	0	0	0	0	225

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				41%	52%	54%	37%	50%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	55%	54%	45%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	47%	47%	42%	41%	47%
Math Achievement				53%	60%	58%	49%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				57%	61%	57%	58%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	52%	51%	52%	53%	51%
Science Achievement				44%	52%	51%	40%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				51%	68%	72%	54%	69%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	40%	56%	-16%	54%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	32%	51%	-19%	52%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
08	2021					
	2019	42%	58%	-16%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	48%	59%	-11%	55%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	26%	42%	-16%	54%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
08	2021					
	2019	61%	68%	-7%	46%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	48%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	49%	70%	-21%	71%	-22%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	60%	40%	61%	39%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	31	35	30	30	38	45	40	55			
ELL	26	41	36	23	28	32	40	44			
ASN	58	63		47	50		82				
BLK	19	25	14	18	24	29	17	48			
HSP	29	35	38	31	34	32	36	53	41		
MUL	29	24	10	33	38	50	44	27			
WHT	37	34	31	39	37	39	52	52	43		
FRL	32	34	31	33	34	37	42	49	39		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	28	40	40	37	52	42	37	35			
ELL	16	42	41	35	56	50	7	27			
ASN	43	29		57	69						
BLK	26	44	40	28	44	31	29	22			
HSP	31	48	47	49	57	48	30	43	35		
MUL	40	37	40	55	60	30	53	58			
WHT	48	49	42	57	58	49	50	58	32		
FRL	39	47	45	49	55	46	41	51	29		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	8	31	34	19	46	49	17	28			
ELL	8	39	54	21	43	36	31	20			
ASN	41	53		56	63						
BLK	20	45	45	27	56	71		40			
HSP	30	42	48	45	54	46	42	39	54		
MUL	37	46	58	60	68	50	47	67			
WHT	41	46	36	53	59	52	40	61	55		
FRL	33	42	42	46	57	51	37	50	48		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	401
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	60
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	24
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	32
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

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

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

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

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

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

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA Achievement and Math Achievement both increased by 4 percent. This was in part due to the role that coaches took in these two areas.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The additions of priority PLCs to dive deeper into the data was a contributing factor to the increase in these two areas.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Increase in Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction. Standards based recovery through APEX

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

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

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Standards based recover through APEX

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Walkthroughs

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Historically at GMS it has been a challenge for administration to be consistent with walkthroughs. We were always scrambling at the end to complete teacher evaluations with fidelity.

Measurable Outcome: Each teacher will have a least 3 walkthroughs documented per semester in MyPGS.

Monitoring: We plan to come together as an administrative team to discuss the current state of our walkthroughs. How many have we done, what are we seeing, what are the trends?

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Riddle (ariddle@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Increase in walkthroughs and feedback will result in an increase in student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our students need to fill the gaps in learning from COVID and we hope to see an increase in student achievement scores. By June 2022, 80%+ students will demonstrate mastery of standards as measured by achieving 70%+ on Common Assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly admin meetings to discuss walkthrough data and trends. Monthly individual admin meetings to discuss responsibilities. Principal will monitor.

Person Responsible Amy Riddle (ariddle@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We began this work last year with implementation of PBIS rewards for students and staff, we want to continue this work.

Measurable Outcome: Goal: Teachers and staff will incorporate the components of Responsive Classroom in order to proactively meet the SEL needs of ALL stakeholders.

Monitoring: Through classroom walkthroughs administration will monitor this area of focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Karen Kledzik (kkledzik@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

*Ensure behavior plans for identified students are current and being monitored.

*Tier 2 supports will be intentionally planned for and evidenced in lesson plans. SIT team will ensure Tier 3 supports are implemented.

*Utilize common assessments to drive instruction.

Person Responsible Amy Riddle (ariddle@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3. Other specifically relating to Data Driven Decisions

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There are multiple gaps in student learning due to COVID that will need to be bridged.
Measurable Outcome:	Goal: Teachers collect and utilize multiple forms of relevant data to guide instructional decisions and effectively develop, monitor, and increase systems to support students' learning in the planning cycle.
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through PLC's we will look at data from a variety of assessments to ensure continue support of student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We know that looking at data will help to identify Tier II and Tier III supports needed for students.
Action Steps to Implement	
Through our PLC's we will look at data monthly to determine the best supports to support student learning.	
Person Responsible	Amy Riddle (ariddle@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

We will continue the use of our PBIS rewards system to promote positive behavior. The discipline committee and PBIS committee will become one to analyze discipline data. The creation of a Principal Advisory Student Group will be a positive step toward including students in schoolwide decisions. We hope to see a decrease in discipline incidences for the current school year.

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.

Last year students received almost 535,000 points in the PBIS rewards system. Teachers received almost 13,500 points. This has been a huge positive culture booster. Pre-Covid we had many incentives and hope to bring them back again. We will be starting monthly clubs this school year.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

All stakeholders are responsible for promoting a positive culture. The students and staff through the PBIS rewards. Administration with planning student and staff activities. The academic coaches with monthly staff treats. The MYP Coordinator who organizes Student and Staff of the Month recognitions.