

The School District of Lee County

Gateway 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Gateway Elementary School

13280 GRIFFIN DR, Fort Myers, FL 33913

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

Demographics

Principal: Cherry Gibson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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)	99%
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: B (58%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 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.

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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Gateway Elementary School

13280 GRIFFIN DR, Fort Myers, FL 33913

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">80%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">62%</p>

School Grades History

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

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gibson, Cherry	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 • Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development • Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible • Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process • Conduct classroom Walkthroughs to monitor fidelity with Principal * Coordinate and facilitate APPLES trainings and meeting for first year teachers *

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, 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.*

4

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

813

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

9

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

6

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	109	135	128	117	150	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	791
Attendance below 90 percent	26	30	17	19	33	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	20	28	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	34	41	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
	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	37	35	46	32	44	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	241

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 9/18/2021

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	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

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	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

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				60%	57%	57%	64%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	56%	58%	54%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	50%	53%	36%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				73%	62%	63%	63%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				75%	65%	62%	41%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	54%	51%	23%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				56%	52%	53%	58%	54%	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	61%	58%	3%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	55%	-1%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	67%	61%	6%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	70%	62%	8%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	72%	58%	14%	60%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	54%	50%	4%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

I-Ready, DIBELS

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17%	39%	
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	
	English Language Learners	4%	14%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11%	33%	
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	
	English Language Learners	8%	11%	

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26	45%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%		
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	
	English Language Learners	0%	9%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11%	33%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28	40%	48%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	7%	13%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9%	29%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	8%	13%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35%	50%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	12%	26%	30%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8%	23%	30%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	11%	11%	11%
	English Language Learners	0%	11%	11%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43%	50%	49%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	13%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26%	40%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	31%	51%	49%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	20%	20%	40%
	English Language Learners	13%	29%	14%

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	11	25		26	50		23				
ELL	15	14		39	64		15				
BLK	37	35		44	35		28				
HSP	35	38	20	51	43	33	30				
MUL	75			58							
WHT	70	62		76	79		76				
FRL	37	37	39	46	43	33	28				
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				

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	401

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	35
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
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	38
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	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	73
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	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 lowest performing area is ELA lowest 25%. In the last three years, Gateway Elementary L25% decreased from 48 points to 36 points. In 2017 -2018, Gateway Elementary L25 decreased from 36 points to 32 points.

ELA Achievement in 2017-2018, Gateway Elementary decreased from 68 to 64 points. In 2018- 2019, ELA Achievement decreased from, 64 to 60 points. Math Achievement increased from 63 points in 2017-2018 to 73 points during the 2018 -2019 school year.

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.

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

ELA declined 4 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. Teacher reported students struggled with stamina and higher level comprehension skills, especially with multiple passages.

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 increase in new to Gateway students in grade 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

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

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 18-19 scores as well as State/District scores. During the 18-19 school year, we increased our Math instructional times across all grade level and used I-Ready Progress monitoring data to focus interventions on math gaps students had in their Math skills.

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

Gateway Elementary increased instructional time in Math and strategically focused on math in "What I Need" (WIN) time to meet the needs of our students and close academic gaps in Math. Afterschool tutoring was offered to students in grades 3-5.

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

Targeted small group instruction, standard based instruction, continuous front loading and spiral review.

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.

- * Cooperative Learning
- * i-Ready
- * High Impact Strategies
- * Behavior Management
- * Data Analysis
- * Team planning/collaboration

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

- * Small group instruction, ongoing/continuous professional development, coaches model and demonstrate best practices, walkthroughs, lesson plans, grade level planning, PLCs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 20-21 school year ELA proficiency scores declined 12 points (from 61 - 49) as compared to 18-19 school year.

Measurable Outcome: Gateway Elementary students will increase ELA scores from 49 to 52 points as measured by May 2022 FSA.

- I-Ready Progress Monitoring
- Formative and Summative Assessments
- Exemplar
- Exit Tickets
- Data Chats

Monitoring: Conduct focused area walkthroughs
Provide teachers feedback

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: 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.

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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 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.

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 Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 20-21 school year ELA learning gain scores will increase from 54 to 57 points compared to 18-19 school year.

Measurable Outcome: Gateway Elementary students will increase ELA scores from 54 to 57 points as measured by May 2022 FSA.

Monitoring: I-Ready Progress Monitoring
Formative and Summative Assessments
Exemplar
Exit Tickets
Data Chats
Conduct focused area walkthroughs
Provide teachers feedback

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: 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. 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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers reported the stamina struggle of students to maintain focus when presented with multiple passages and student lack of grade level readings 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.

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 Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Gateway Elementary must increase the Learning gains for our Lowest 25% students in ELA.

Measurable Outcome: Gateway Elementary students will increase ELA Learning Gain scores for Lowest 25% from 25% to 32% as measured by 2022 FSA ELA Assessment.

Monitoring: 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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: 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. Implement fluency activities to increase student fluency skills

Person Responsible Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the Early Warning System 54 out of 149 students in grades 3, 4, 5 have 10% or more absences.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders in the Early Warning System will reduce excessive absences of 10% or more from 45% to 35%.

Monitoring: Social worker and Administration will check weekly attendance.
Social worker will contact parents by phone
Make home visits to assist families
Encourage regular attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@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: Social worker and Administration will check on weekly attendance report.
Parent contact
Offer quarterly incentives - Awards, certificates, parties.

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 Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Gateway Elementary referrals and OSS referrals have been trending down since 2017.

Measurable Outcome: By May 2022, Gateway Elementary will reduce the number of student referrals by 10% as compared to the 2020-2021 school year.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: 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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 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: Cherry Gibson (cherrymg@leeschools.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.

N/A

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.

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.

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

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.

Curriculum Night is also an opportunity for parents and the community to be involved and instructed in our District and School Curriculum. "Make and Take" activities were designed to supplement Reading and Math instruction. 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.

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
Total:			\$0.00