Gulf Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Gulf Elementary School

3400 SW 17TH PL, Cape Coral, FL 33914

http://gfe.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Kim Verblaauw

Start Date for this Principal: 9/19/2021

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)	45%
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (62%)
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

Gulf Elementary School

3400 SW 17TH PL, Cape Coral, FL 33914

http://gfe.leeschools.net/

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	63%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

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 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.

To create a community of learners who are equipped with the knowledge, strength of character, and desire to reflect on the past, achieve in the present, and build for the future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a World Class School.

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
Verblaauw, Kim	Principal	
Beckman, Dawn	Assistant Principal	
Thomas, Brooke	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 9/19/2021, Kim Verblaauw

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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
72

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,172

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
4

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	185	178	191	193	200	225	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1172
Attendance below 90 percent	2	26	20	14	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	18	4	12	18	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Course failure in Math	0	5	1	6	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	20	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
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	12	1	8	26	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	9	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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
Sunday 9/19/2021

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	150	165	167	185	180	199	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1046
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	10	6	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	9	4	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	2	1	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	150	165	167	185	180	199	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1046
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	10	6	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	9	4	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	2	1	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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				75%	57%	57%	71%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	56%	58%	60%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	50%	53%	43%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				77%	62%	63%	76%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				69%	65%	62%	68%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	54%	51%	64%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				66%	52%	53%	65%	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	77%	58%	19%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	77%	55%	22%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	74%	54%	20%	56%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	80%	61%	19%	62%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
	2019	77%	62%	15%	64%	13%	
Cohort Comparison		-80%					
05	2021						
	2019	76%	58%	18%	60%	16%	
Cohort Comparison		-77%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2021						
	2019	69%	50%	19%	53%	16%	
Cohort Comparison							

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady. and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27/17.2	44/25.7	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.3	2/8.7	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20/13	39/22.7	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.3	1/4.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	2/25	0/0	0/0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39/25	81/48.5	1/33.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/14.3	3/21.4	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/22.2	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/9	37/22.4	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/7.1	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/11.1	1/11.1	0/0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65/36.9	108/58.7	120/65.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/18.2	5/38.5
	English Language Learners	1/50	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24/13.9	79/42.9	114/62
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/7.7
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/25

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	74/44.6	116/63.4	135/71.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/15.4	2/13.3	3/20
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/50	1/25
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23/14.4	69/37.9	114/61
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	3/20	4/26.7
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	90/47.4	122/60.1	142/68.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/23.5	6/31.6	8/40
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/11.1
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42/22.5	84/41.2	119/57.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.3	3/15.8	6/30
	English Language Learners	1/16.7	0/0	3/33.3
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	72/37.3	102/52	117/62.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	9/50	9/52.9	13/65
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	2/28.6

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	22	43		34	38	30	32				
ELL	58			58							
BLK	53	67		61	50		29				
HSP	62	50	46	67	54	53	35				
MUL	67	58		78	58		58				
WHT	67	57	27	72	55	24	62				
FRL	53	49	36	60	49	32	41				

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	29	45	54	32	45	40	20				
ELL	59	44		59	56						
ASN	73			91							
BLK	46	62		63	69						
HSP	71	66	57	71	66	51	62				
MUL	71	59		68	65						
WHT	79	64	57	82	71	55	75				
FRL	68	61	59	73	67	55	63				

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	24	33	26	25	55	44	31				
ELL	36	36	25	55	53	50					
ASN	83			92							
BLK	61	43		50	57						
HSP	59	49	36	65	62	59	52				
MUL	73	69		62	63						
WHT	77	65	51	83	71	79	71				
FRL	65	57	45	73	67	53	57				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	419
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	55
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	
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	52
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	52
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	64

Multiracial Students	
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	52
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	46
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?

Students in the L25 in 5th grade Reading and Math show the greatest need. Our 5th Grade ELA went from 57% down to 30%, a 27% decrease in Math L25 for 5th graders. For Math L25 5th graders, the average went from 55% down to 32%, a 23% decrease in Math L25 scores. In Science, our 5th graders went from 66% proficiency to 53% proficiency.

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

Our L25 students in Reading and Math and 5th grade Science scores are in greatest need for improvement.

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

COVID, quarantine restrictions, chronic attendance concerns, and not getting students online were the biggest contributing factors to our students needing improvements. We are going to have Extended School day to help offer free tutoring for students, specifically our L25 students.

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

Our Grade 4 Learning gains were the most improved, with 100% of our students making learning gains in 4th grade.

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

Instructional guides, Academic Plans, PLC's, and i-ready helped with this improvement

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

i-Ready, Freckle, Reflex, Imagine Learning (ESOL), and tutoring will be available for all students that need it.

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.

i-Ready, Imagine Learning, ESOL Strategies for differentiated students

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

Extended tutoring services for L25 students in 4th and 5th grades. We have purchased additional resources to help ensure that science is being taught with fidelity in all 5th grade classes.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ELA L25 Gains in Reading was 30%, 6% points below the District average of 36%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the % of L25 students making learning gains in Reading.
Monitoring:	i-Ready diagnostic tests will help us to identify how our L25 students are progressing throughout the year. Administration will be monitoring i-Ready instructional usage for all students, especially the L25s.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Verblaauw (kimberlyav@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research and expert opinion provide a sound basis for reading instruction that addresses phonological awareness, phonics, automatic recognition of high-frequency words, vocabulary development, and development of reading comprehension skills and strategies. i-Ready addresses all of these components.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our teachers and students have bought into the effectiveness of i-Ready and using the instructional groupings to help sort students into specific leveled groupings.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Alignment of instruction of i-ready across the curriculum- PLC/Collaborative Planning
2. Students will have their own data folder to help track their data
3. Students will work 45 minutes each week on their i-Ready personalized instruction path
4. Teachers will work with L25 students to determine their needs, as based on the diagnostic test and their individualized instruction.

Person Responsible   Kim Verblaauw (kimberlyav@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Math L25 Gains in Math was 32%, 1% point above the District average of 31%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the % of L25 students making learning gains in Math.
Monitoring:	i-Ready diagnostic tests will help us to identify how our L25 students are progressing throughout the year. Administration will be monitoring i-Ready instructional usage for all students, especially the L25s.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Verblaauw (kimberlyav@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	i-Ready math is a responsive instruction that provides consistent insight into student understanding and performance, enabling teachers to monitor their students' progress and help them prepare for standards-based assessments and beyond.ion provide a sound basis for math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our teachers and students have bought into the effectiveness of i-Ready and using the instructional groupings to help sort students into specific leveled groupings to help support students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Alignment of instruction of i-ready across the curriculum- PLC/Collaborative Planning
2. Students will have their own data folder to help track their data
3. Students will work 45 minutes each week on their i-Ready personalized instruction path
4. Teachers will work with L25 students to determine their needs, as based on the diagnostic test and their individualized instruction.

Person Responsible	Kim Verblaauw (kimberlyav@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Science Proficiency scores in 5th grade were 53%, a 13% drop from the year before.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the % of proficiency on Grade 5 FSA Science from 53% to 56%, as measured by the FY22 Science FSA.
Monitoring:	Using progress monitoring tools provided through the LCSD, all 5th grade students' science progress will be monitored throughout the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Verblaauw (kimberlyav@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All activities in a student's science education should be based on science as inquiry. 30 minutes of science in grade K-3 and 45 minutes science instruction in grades 4 & 5. Students also attend STEM special 1x per week for 30 minutes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the National Science Education Standards, engaging students in inquiry serves the following five essential functions: Assists in the development of understanding of scientific concepts, helps student "know how we know" in science, develops an understanding of the nature of science, develops the skills necessary to become independent inquiries about the natural world, and develops the dispositions to use the skills, abilities, and habits of mind.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Alignment of instruction across the curriculum- PLC/Collaborative Planning
2. Interactive science journals and P-Cell books; student work samples
3. Progress Monitoring report data
4. STEM lessons focusing on grade 4 & 5 FSA Science assessed items
5. Classroom walk throughs during essential science labs

Person Responsible	Kim Verblaauw (kimberlyav@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Our school did not report any incidents in the 2020-2021 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.

Gulf Elementary builds positive relationships with families through such events as: Meet the Teacher, Open House, Technology Night, Fall Festival, Drama production, K-2 music performances, Bring Your Dad to Work Day, STEM Night, Food Drive, End of Year Awards Ceremonies, Art Shows, PTO, and SAC.
The school's mission and vision are shared during PTO meetings, SAC meetings and through school publications such as the school's website and letters sent home throughout the year.
To keep parents informed of their child's progress, parents receive interim reports and report cards quarterly. Parents are made aware through school events and publications that students' academics, attendance, standardized test results, and discipline data are always available through The School District of Lee County Parent Portal and online Gradebook. Teachers hold a
minimum of one conference per year to discuss their child's progress. When deficiencies are found, parents are informed immediately by their child's teacher. The school utilizes School Messenger, the school website, newsletters, Twitter, FaceBook, the school marquee, and student planners to keep parents informed about important dates, reminders, and upcoming events at the school.
Parents, teachers, students, and community members review previous year data at SAC meeting to develop school improvement plan goals for the upcoming year. Quarterly student progress data is reviewing at the SAC meeting during the school year.

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

Our PBIS team has worked with the staff this year to help create a more positive learning environments for all. We have hung up our EAGLE expectations around the school, ensuring that all students and staff are aware of our expectations and procedures. This has directly worked with our LiveSchool system to help students earn positive LiveShool points for following the EAGLE Expectations at school. Our PBIS team is in charge of promoting the LiveSchool point system and setting up the LiveSchool store. This store is a way for students to "cash-in" their positive LiveSchool points for various prizes. These prizes vary from tangible items to coupons such as positive phone call home or lunch with the Principal. In addition, being such a large school, we looked for a way to bring our students and staff together. The House System that we have implemented ties with the LiveSchool and PBIS systems and the environment and culture at our school has increased tremendously as a result.

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: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00