Gorrie Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Gorrie Elementary School

705 W DELEON ST, Tampa, FL 33606

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Marjorie Sandler

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	15%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (69%)
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 Hillsborough 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

Gorrie Elementary School

705 W DELEON ST, Tampa, FL 33606

[no web address on file]

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 KG-5	No	17%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

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 Hillsborough 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.

I show....
Cooperation
Acceptance
Responsibility and
Effort
Because I CARE!!

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create and engage life-long learners from classroom to community and back.

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
Sandler, Marjorie	Principal	Directs and coordinates educational, administrative and counseling activities of an elementary public school by performing assigned duties personally or through subordinate supervisors.Serves as the instructional leader, develops and evaluates educational program to ensure conformance of state, national and school board standards.
Kiernan, Lauren	Assistant Principal	Directs and coordinates educational, administrative and counseling activities of an elementary public school by performing assigned duties personally or through subordinate supervisors. Serves as the instructional leader, develops and evaluates educational program to ensure conformance of state, national and school board standards.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/29/2021, Marjorie Sandler

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.*
2

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
39

Total number of students enrolled at the school
511

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
5

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	75	70	88	81	98	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	510
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	7	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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
Tuesday 8/31/2021

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	79	56	82	93	99	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	516
Attendance below 90 percent	3	7	5	5	9	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	79	56	82	93	99	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	516
Attendance below 90 percent	3	7	5	5	9	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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				85%	52%	57%	81%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	55%	58%	65%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				69%	50%	53%	48%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				87%	54%	63%	86%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				80%	57%	62%	78%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	46%	51%	69%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				80%	50%	53%	79%	51%	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	87%	52%	35%	58%	29%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	87%	55%	32%	58%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2021					
	2019	78%	54%	24%	56%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	84%	54%	30%	62%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	89%	57%	32%	64%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2021					
	2019	85%	54%	31%	60%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	78%	51%	27%	53%	25%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Diagnostic Math and Reading/ Science Baseline (Average Percent Correct), MidYear(Average Percent Correct) and SSA (%3 or higher)

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	48.15	67	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	52	71
	Students With Disabilities	57	50	43
	English Language Learners	0	0	50
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	50	67	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	41	60
	Students With Disabilities	56	64	87
	English Language Learners	0	30	60

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53	64	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	37	33
	Students With Disabilities	63	47	39
	English Language Learners	0	33	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	45	71	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	39	51
	Students With Disabilities	62	78	86
	English Language Learners	7	73	73

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76	73	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	38	62
	Students With Disabilities	74	68	65
	English Language Learners	50	50	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44	63	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	29	43
	Students With Disabilities	62	73	76
	English Language Learners	10	30	60

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	57	65	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	42	66
	Students With Disabilities	60	59	62
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	50	70	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	52	65
	Students With Disabilities	61	78	69
	English Language Learners	0	60	80

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	58	64	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	42	66
	Students With Disabilities	69	60	63
	English Language Learners	0	0	50
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	52	70	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	51	60
	Students With Disabilities	66	79	76
	English Language Learners	20	20	50
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Science	All Students	73.5	71.28	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	58.05	57.93	33
	Students With Disabilities	85.3	79.46	55.6
	English Language Learners	30.95	32.5	50

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	57			67							
ASN	93			86							
BLK	36			27							
HSP	69	64		67	82		64				
MUL	71			67							
WHT	87	57	43	87	77	86	73				
FRL	58	64		53	64		53				
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	77	80	57	85						
ELL					70						
BLK	38	50		63	75	70					
HSP	74	67		74	71	57	60				
MUL	93			87							
WHT	89	69	81	90	81	63	86				
FRL	66	69	54	68	65	43	55				
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	44	53	45	59	61	55	40				
ELL	60			80							
BLK	18	30	30	33	70						
HSP	80	59	50	89	74	82	78				
MUL	94	91		88	100						
WHT	85	66	48	89	76	58	82				
FRL	56	50	29	61	68	58	36				

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	72
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	503

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	62
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	90
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	32
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	69
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	69
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	58
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 consistently showed growth from fall to spring diagnostic. Some of ESE subgroup trended down

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

ELA and gains in bottom quartile showed the 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?

Many quarantines due to covid of both students and staff led to decreased instruction. Acceleration will be used for just in time learning.

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

Gains in mathematics and bottom quartile in mathematics.

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

Use of monthly common assessments for planning and implementation.

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

Use of common assessment based on standards, continuous progress monitoring, and small group instruction.

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.

Professional study day focused on acceleration. Monthly PLC meetings to plan for instruction using current data. Data chats with grade level standards. Professional development to support the focus of acceleration.

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

Utilizing resources and student services to support social and emotional learning. Capturing teacher strengths to leverage expertise among faculty members and use to support schoolwide professional development.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers need to enhance alignment of specific assignment and lesson plans to meet the rigor of the standards. Classroom observations data was reviewed to identify this need.
Measurable Outcome:	Students scoring a level 3 or higher in ELA increase from _82____ to __87___%
Monitoring:	The use of common assessments (pre-requisites and iReady Diagnostics) will be monitored monthly to determine student growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marjorie Sandler (marjorie.sandler@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide phonics instruction (SIPPS) to support growth of Tier 3 students. Plan strategically using data analysis and assessment information to accelerate students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students have deficits in phonics and require further instruction. This will also support vocabulary development to increase student comprehension of text. Resources include Wonders, SIPPS, LAFS Reading, NewsELA

Action Steps to Implement

Grade level PLC meetings used to discuss data and strategically plan lessons

Person Responsible	Lauren Kiernan (lauren.kiernan@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

School-wide data chats to discuss and monitor student growth and determine trends among the grade levels.

Person Responsible	Lauren Kiernan (lauren.kiernan@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

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.

Gorrie has significantly less behavior and discipline data each year. The school-wide focus to support culture and environment includes Social Emotional support within classrooms and trainings for Restorative Practices.

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.

The school theme for this year, Individually we grow, together we blossom embraces all cultures and backgrounds. The school hosts many community involvement activities, both curriculum and social emotional driven. Examples include core curriculum nights, fall festival, drama performances, storytelling festival, reading celebration, movie nights. In school programs include, Grandparents Day, Veterans Day. Great American Teach IN. Gorrie Cares promotes community partnership as well as compassion for others. Girls Leadership focus' on inner self esteem. Student Government and Ambassadors build leadership, team work and community service. Over the summer, PTA purchased a class library for each classroom with literature that embraced all cultures, so that ALL children can identify with characters when choosing books.

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

Administrative Team Sets the Tone
A Diversity and Inclusion Committee
Parent Diversity and Inclusion Team
Teachers create strong social emotional support for their students through literature and explicit instruction
School Counselor will provide classroom guidance to support well-being practices within the

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: B.E.S.T. Standards	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00