

Manatee County Public Schools

B.D. Gullett Elementary 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 8/7/2017

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	21%
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: A (69%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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 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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

B.D. Gullett Elementary School

12125 44TH AVE E, Bradenton, FL 34211

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

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)
Elementary School PK-5	No	16%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Richardson, Todd	Principal	
Gierhart, Julie	Assistant Principal	
McCaw, Lauren	Other	
Killian, Kathryn	Other	
Barnes, Brittani	Teacher, K-12	
Carter, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
Wardell, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Johnson, Tabitha	Paraprofessional	
Baggetta, Gaby	Teacher, K-12	
Collett, Felicia	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/7/2017, 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.*

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

77

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,271

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

4

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

9

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	145	213	178	217	220	183	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1156
Attendance below 90 percent	12	9	7	15	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	10	3	12	13	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	11	4	7	9	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	25	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	16	25	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	6	1	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/13/2021

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	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	

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	

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	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	

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	

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				76%	52%	57%	79%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	57%	58%	67%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	55%	53%	61%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				80%	63%	63%	79%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				73%	68%	62%	77%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	53%	51%	64%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				74%	48%	53%	74%	49%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	73%	51%	22%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	56%	19%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	75%	52%	23%	56%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	82%	60%	22%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	78%	65%	13%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2021					
	2019	76%	60%	16%	60%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	71%	48%	23%	53%	18%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

K ELA

K Letter/Sound Data

iReady

Jan Richardson Next Steps Assessment

DIBELS NWF

Grades (progress reports/ report cards)

K Math

iReady

Grades (progress reports/ report cards)

1st ELA

iReady

Jan Richardson Next Steps Assessment

DIBELS ORF & NWF

Grades (progress reports/ report cards)

1st Math

iReady

Grades (progress reports/ report cards)

2nd ELA

iReady

Jan Richardson Next Steps Assessment

DIBELS ORF

Grades (progress reports/ report cards)

2nd Math

iReady

EnVision Intervention System

Grades (progress reports/ report cards)

3rd ELA

iReady
Jan Richardson Next Steps Assessment
DIBELS ORF & MAZE
Benchmark Assessments
Grades (progress reports/ report cards)
3rd Math
iReady
EnVision Intervention System
Benchmark Assessments
Grades (progress reports/ report cards)

4th ELA
iReady
Jan Richardson Next Steps Assessment
DIBELS ORF & MAZE
Benchmark Assessments
Grades (progress reports/ report cards)
4th Math
iReady
Acaletics
Benchmark Assessments
Grades (progress reports/ report cards)

5th ELA
iReady
Jan Richardson Next Steps Assessment
DIBELS ORF & MAZE
Benchmark Assessments
Grades (progress reports/ report cards)
5th Math
iReady
Acaletics
Benchmark Assessments
Grades (progress reports/ report cards)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35	74	85
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	54	72
	Students With Disabilities	19	50	65
	English Language Learners	14	13	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31	70	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	39	56
	Students With Disabilities	19	46	69
	English Language Learners	0	13	38
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45	72	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	39	64
	Students With Disabilities	25	56	53
	English Language Learners	22	60	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29	63	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	39	64
	Students With Disabilities	31	44	60
	English Language Learners	11	10	70

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67	83	89
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	54	55
	Students With Disabilities	42	32	39
	English Language Learners	87	75	69
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26	58	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	58	56
	Students With Disabilities	53	57	44
	English Language Learners	73	58	62
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	51	63	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	56	40	50
	Students With Disabilities	24	25	20
	English Language Learners	56	56	87
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39	69	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	39	51
	Students With Disabilities	44	26	42
	English Language Learners	69	75	81

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50	65	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	62	58
	Students With Disabilities	41	43	50
	English Language Learners	43	50	54
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52	71	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	55	66
	Students With Disabilities	57	48	55
	English Language Learners	57	53	69
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52	65	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	47	45
	Students With Disabilities	24	48	34
	English Language Learners	54	62	55

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	35	42	42	49	68	67	37				
ELL	71			74							
ASN	61			78							
BLK	41			47							
HSP	71	57	30	71	57		62				
MUL	89			96							
WHT	75	61	52	81	71	64	68				
FRL	53	52	30	59	61	47	49				
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				

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
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				

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	67
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	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	533
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	75
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	70
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	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	93
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Data indicates that our lowest performance is in Learning Gains. Not only are we focusing on learning gains with our SWD Subgroup, but we have many students who are proficient (3s and 4s) that fall into our lowest quartile.

This trend is carried in all content areas and is evident in our progress monitoring data as well.

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

Our data component that showed the lowest performance was our Learning Gains categories. In this we have our lowest quartile learning gains, as well as our students scoring 4s and 5s who have to be considered in this category.

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 need for small group differentiation addressing both students who are not at proficiency as well as students who are above level is necessary. All groups need to be differentiated. We also noticed that our students with disabilities were showing 43% proficiency in ELA (2019). Another factor to consider is our rapid growth in student population, including a large increase in the number of students with disabilities.

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

According to our 2019 state assessments, our Math Achievement Proficiency increased from 79% to 80% proficient. We previously implemented the MAFS curriculum as well as used heterogeneous math grouping in our third grade classrooms, where 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.

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

Contributing factors to growth during the past state assessments, (2019 and 2021) were daily small group differentiation in ELA and Math. Regularly scheduled data meetings to review student data at each grade level allowed for instructional groups to be fluid.

Previous MAFS curriculum and current Academics curriculum facilitated the growth in math

proficiency.

Continued emphasis throughout the school to use more differentiated small groups during Math instruction after a whole groups introduction to the standard being taught. Offering teachers professional development in small group math instruction. Teachers discussed and shared this vertically among teams.

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

Continued instruction in small groups that remain fluid throughout the year. Continuation of Acaletics curriculum for math.

Begin to implement the Acaletics curriculum for added science instruction.

Professional development for teachers, face to face and through Schoology.

Peer walks for teachers.

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.

Collaborative planning with embedded professional development.

Professional Development focusing on best practices in Math and Science.

Schoology resources related to Social & Emotional Learning, with embedded Professional Development.

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

Additional Professional Development, monthly, will be provided for teachers/staff focusing on Math and Science Instruction. While some school and district PD will be required, we will be providing staff with opportunities for optional PD.

With the addition of a second guidance counselor, we have created more time for small groups in the area of social and emotional learning.

Administration will be meeting at least monthly with Team Leaders to discuss data and will also meet weekly with grade level teams to relay any relevant information related to the SIP, student data and Professional Development opportunities.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Effective instructional practice is an important avenue to learning gains. We noticed that one critical area of need is to focus on our learning gains in ELA, with a focus on our Students With Disabilities (SWD). 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 also make learning gains. According to our data from 2021, there is a need to ensure that our learning gains increase. Our current lowest quartile of students in ELA include students who met proficiency according to the 2021 FSA. Differentiation of instruction will be an important key to the success of our school.

Measurable Outcome:

By May 2022, we will increase our ELA lowest quartile learning gains by 10%, as evidenced on the FLorida Standards Assessment (FSA). (Correlation can be derived from the Quarter 2 ELA District Benchmark Assessment and iReady Spring Diagnostic, in the absence of FSA scores).

Monitoring:

Grade level data meetings occur monthly with administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@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 ELA. Tri-annually iReady and Jan Richardson Assessments will be administered. Teachers will flexibly group students to meet the different needs 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 need. 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, 2011). 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 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

Continue to offer professional development opportunities for teachers to support differentiated instruction in ELA, via Schoology. The ELA PD will continue to focus on guided reading instruction through three steps: (1) assessment, (2) design, and (3) implementation.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

Plan grade level opportunities for data driven instructional planning quarterly (collaborative planning).

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

Develop coaching cycles with teachers to improve differentiated instruction efficacy.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

Group ESE students into identified inclusion classrooms and provide appropriate support into these classrooms to ensure differentiation.

Person Responsible Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

Provide support (monthly meetings) for new teachers to Gullett and to our School District, focusing on curriculum, best practices, and other classroom supports.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

Provide support for teachers on collecting data onto spreadsheets to use for planning purposes. Teacher will use School City as a data collection resource for iReady, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, and Jan Richardson Data.

Person Responsible Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

Provide weekly grade level support by joining in grade level team meetings.

Person Responsible Todd Richardson (richardt@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus	Providing effective re-teaching and activating prior knowledge to facilitate the delivery of future core instruction an important avenue to learning gains. Gullett's 2020-2021 Science data reflects that 68% of our students are proficient in this content area.
Description and Rationale:	By May 2022, we will increase our Science proficiency by 5%, as evidenced on the State Science Assessment. (Correlation can be derived from the Q2 Science District Benchmark Assessment and HMH or Acaletics Assessment, in the absence of SSA scores.)
Measurable Outcome:	Our fifth grade teachers will utilize the Science Acaletics program. This program provides highly effective and engaging lessons that align with the grade 5 Science benchmarks/standards. The Science Acaletics is used as a supplement to our existing science curriculum. Teachers will be able to determine whether or not there is a need to review or re-teach previously covered benchmarks/standards in your core curriculum as well as provide students prior knowledge to facilitate the delivery of future core instruction of benchmarks/standards. Gullett will increase their Science achievement to 73% on the Spring 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	District Benchmark assessments HMH assessments Acaletics (science) assessments Grade level data meetings weekly team planning/meeting
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Science Acaletics provides highly effective and engaging lessons that align with grade 5 science benchmark/standards. The Science Acaletics is used to supplement our existing science curriculum. The WOZ science resources are specific to Next Generation Sunshine State Science Standards, helping students learn more science topics than those included in the Next Generation Science Standards. They emphasize doing science, giving the learner the opportunity to pose questions and discover answers through project-based, hands-on experience. The standards call for students to form hypotheses, test theories, and analyze data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing the WOZ materials make it possible for students to experience what scientists do to investigate the natural world and what engineers do to design and build systems. These project-based lessons and materials promote scientific inquiry, engaging students in practices that establish foundational knowledge of core scientific ideas and build on that foundation to ensure a cohesive understanding of science.

Action Steps to Implement

Implementation and professional Development opportunities for teachers focusing on the WOZ program.

Person Responsible Rachel Carter (carterr04@manateeschools.net)

Establish a Science Committee focusing on science curriculum and lateral planning.

Person Responsible Rachel Carter (carterr04@manateeschools.net)

Plan for Acaletics (Science) implementation & progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

Lateral Planning during quarterly grade level collaborative planning half days.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Gullett Elementary is returning to 100% brick and mortar learning for the 2021-2022 school year. As we welcome our students back to the building, we are mindful that students may need more social and emotional support. Research shows that if 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. Current data collected from Office Discipline Referrals, observations and student surveys indicates a need to continue to focus on our Social Emotional Learning Environment.

By April 2022, the results of our climate survey will indicate a 10% increase in April when compared to the results from September 2021.

By May 2022, ORDs will decrease by 5% when compared to the ODRs from May 2021.

Measurable Outcome:

To measure the success of our Social Emotional Learning, we will create a Social Emotional Climate Survey in Microsoft Forms for all our 3rd - 5th grade students. This will be given to our students in September and again in April. We will compare the data to measure the success of our plans. We will also continue to use the office discipline data as well as observational data for the year to measure success.

Monitoring:

Our school administrative team, our school counselors, along with other school leaders will monitor the use of Purposeful People (Elementary Social Emotional Curriculum) during daily morning meeting and Character Strong Lessons. Administration will also follow-up, ensuring that all staff members attend the required Mental Health Training as well as encourage and offer PD in the area of Social Emotional Learning. School Counselors will run small groups focusing on: Social Skills, Peer Relations, Friendship, Anxiety, among others.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@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:

Two years ago, we began the implementation of Morning Meeting. Last year, we 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. We are utilizing Character Strong and incorporating Purposeful s as People in our Morning Meetings.

Action Steps to Implement

Continue Morning Meetings in the classroom, utilize Purposeful People.

Person Responsible

Kathryn Killian (killiank@manateeschools.net)

Analyze teacher observations to determine small group and individual intervention needs.

Person Responsible

Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

Assign the SEL Survey to students.

Person Responsible Kathryn Killian (killiank@manateeschools.net)

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

Person Responsible Kathryn Killian (killiank@manateeschools.net)

Plan and deliver lessons to address specific needs as determined through teacher observation, survey results, observation, or Office Discipline Referral Data.

Person Responsible Kathryn Killian (killiank@manateeschools.net)

Additional school counselor, allowing time for more counseling groups.

Person Responsible Zoe Christenson (christensonz@manateeschools.net)

Weekly social skills groups and individual counseling sessions offered throughout the school year.

Person Responsible Zoe Christenson (christensonz@manateeschools.net)

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.

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 in the area of ELA, especially with our Students with Disabilities. We will focus on proficiency in the area of Science and continue to provide an environment that is providing appropriate Social and Emotional learning and support. 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.

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.

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 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 and/or in person this year. 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 perspective 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 Wednesday to ensure that individual students are receiving appropriate interventions to help them grow academically as well as social and emotionally.

Overall, the staff, the students, and their families continue to provide 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. Whether through the Character Strong Program for students, family events, the school social media accounts or our staff Sunshine Committee, we are continuously building a positive school culture and environment.

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

Our school has developed and maintained partnerships with many local organizations in the community who continue to provide resources to support student achievement. Our School Coordinator along with our PTO approach and work with businesses to see if they are willing to support our school.

Each quarter, we hold award assemblies for all grade levels. Students are recognized in several categories

including, but not limited to academic achievement, displaying behaviors that match the Character Trait of the Month and earning Top Gator, through our schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports. We receive coupons from our Business Partners to reward our students quarterly.

Our PTO is an integral part of our school and maintains a website and social media profile for parents to access. PTO recruits parents to help with events and attend monthly PTO and SAC meetings. Parents are very active in our school through volunteering, leading and participating in events that support our school and students.