

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Gorrie Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	15%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (74%) 2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (72%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	15%
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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

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.
	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 2022 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.*

35

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

486

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

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

7

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	72	84	68	87	81	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	486
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	7	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	0	3	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 8/30/2022

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	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	

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	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	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	80%	53%	56%				85%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%						68%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						69%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	86%	50%	50%				87%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	86%						80%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	73%						63%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	59%	59%				80%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	87%	52%	35%	58%	29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	87%	55%	32%	58%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2022					
	2019	78%	54%	24%	56%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	84%	54%	30%	62%	22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	89%	57%	32%	64%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2022					
	2019	85%	54%	31%	60%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	78%	51%	27%	53%	25%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	30	47	38	52	56	42					
ELL	60			80							
ASN	91			91							
BLK	15	36		32	60						
HSP	84	60		81	68	50	62				
MUL	65	55		80	91						
WHT	87	74	57	94	91	88	87				
FRL	43	50	37	61	76	67	44				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
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	520
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	70
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	91
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	68
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	83
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 or maintained from Fall assessments to Spring assessments. Reading/ELA 3rd grade 76% to 74% proficiency. 4th Grade 57% to 73% proficiency and 5th Grade, 58% to 65% proficiency. In Math 3rd grade 44% to 74% proficiency, 4th grade 50% to 74% proficiency and 5th grade 52% to 74% proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

One of the areas that we believe will show the greatest improvement based on the lack of growth in the ELA bottom quartile Dropping in the same areas as above from a 74% to a 65% for 3rd grade, maintaining 60-62% in 4th grade and 69 to 63%.

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 contributing factors were based on the students schedule, their missing some core instructional time, and common progress monitoring tools to view and shift the instructional outcomes as needed.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math in all areas showed the most improvement. The students with disability showed the following growth in math 3rd grade - 62-76% 4th grade 61-69% and 5th grade 66-76%.

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

Good content guides, materials relevant to the standards, and teachers participating in professional development that was geared to their personal growth needs. As well as students not being pulled out of the structured classroom.

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

Content knowledge of the teacher and understanding how to shift their instruction based on what gap/needs the student needs. Common assessments and data chats that require deep conversations about the trends with action steps on how to implement a plan.

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 Development will be based on the teacher needs, the student data, and the information administration gathers through walkthroughs and observations.

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

Our resource teachers, ESE - Gifted, will engage themselves into the planning with the classroom teachers. This implementation will allow for the students that may get pulled out to support those students within the content areas.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Throughout the past few years, students have performed in the high 70's and low 80's within the ELA realm with both the high performing students and the students that do not. The instructional practice contributes to this in multiple ways. Because the students are high achievers, some instructional teachers do not push themselves to know how to push the high achievers. On the flip side of that, they may also demonstrate a similar behavior when teaching the low performing students.

Measurable**Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA BQ in
2018 = 65%
2019 = 69%
2020 = 50%
2021 = 49%

For four years the trends have been consistently low across the board. Restructuring our focus on instructional time being the main focus of our school day, as well as all students are in the core content area without being pulled out or the class being interrupted, is what we believe is key to increasing these numbers - especially the 2021 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will use our data tracker to monitor trends across the grade levels. Have all PLC meetings to revolve around data. To date, teachers have identified their grade level BQ and their class level BQ to be aware of where the students that need to have a push.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marjorie Sandler (marjorie.sandler@hcps.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Have data chats within the week of any data point with a plan on how to proceed or adjust instruction as required by each Child's performance. Students will maintain their own data notebooks and develop goals around their own data. The children will share that with their parents as the data is available

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

To improve student knowledge and develop their cognitive thinking and problem solving to be successful in the future.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

We will use our data tracker to monitor trends across the grade levels.

Have all PLC meetings to revolve around data. To date, teachers have identified their grade level BQ and their class level BQ to be aware of where the students that need to have a push.

Have data chats within the week of any data point with a plan on how to proceed or adjust instruction as required by each Childs performance.

Students will maintain their own data notebooks and develop goals around their own data. The children will share that with their parents as the data is available

Person

Responsible

Marjorie Sandler (marjorie.sandler@hcps.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Our school theme is We Shine Brighter Together, focusing on our attitudes and approach to different systems and structures that may not be easy to make. This includes a schedule change with complete curriculum minutes accounted for. Data being the center of all conversations and instructional decisions, and making shifts to current mindsets that focus on what is best for the students and our school.

The teachers lounge has been redecorated and more inviting and teachers are eating together and having great discussions.

We will have a workshop at the school that focuses on "our purpose" and how we ignite the love for teaching regardless of the outside influences.

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

Marjorie Sandler, Principal, leading the charge to support the necessary changes.

Inviting the Ignite your Shine workshop personnel to come speak to our teachers

Having community events come into the school supporting the need for teachers and parents to connect

Alesha Looper, Assistant Principal, leading the change on instructional shifts that allow for teachers to teach uninterrupted.

Providing current data so teachers do not feel that is 'one more thing for them to do'

Creating fun thematic meetings with a purpose