

Collier County Public Schools

# Gulfview Middle School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Gulfview Middle School

255 6TH ST S, Naples, FL 34102

<https://www.collierschools.com/gvm>

### Demographics

**Principal: Ryan Nemeth**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	74%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (67%) 2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (76%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Gulfview Middle School

255 6TH ST S, Naples, FL 34102

<https://www.collierschools.com/gvm>

### 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)
Middle School 6-8	No	74%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

### School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		I	A

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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 are committed to maintaining a positive school identity that promotes academic focus, personal safety, and maximum potential where success is recognized and celebrated for all students.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our vision is to foster a lifelong love of learning and achievement for every student by utilizing an ongoing partnership among school, family, and community.

### 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
Nemeth, Ryan	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Supports school-wide implementation of an integrated (academic and behavior) databased planning and problem solving system using a variety of assessment tools to monitor student progress.</li> <li>*Assists teams in the selection and implementation of research and/or evidenced-based academic and behavioral interventions to promote student progress.</li> <li>* Assists teams in analyzing student data and identifying formative assessments to use as the basis for data-driven instructional decisions.</li> </ul>
Kinstler, Mitchell	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Assists teams in the selection and implementation of research and/or evidenced-based academic and behavioral interventions to promote student progress.</li> <li>* Assists teams in analyzing student data and identifying formative assessments to use as the basis for data-driven instructional decisions.</li> </ul>
Schafer, Jocelyn	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Provides intensive instructional interventions (Tier 3) to support student achievement (academic and behavioral).</li> <li>* Works collaboratively with district and school-based leadership teams, including academic coaches, to monitor fidelity and support capacity development and sustainability of MTSS implementation.</li> </ul>
Travis, Gina	Reading Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Works collaboratively with district and school-based leadership teams, including academic coaches, to monitor fidelity and support capacity development and sustainability of MTSS implementation.</li> <li>* Provides intensive instructional interventions (Tier 3) to support student achievement (academic and behavioral).</li> <li>*Provides training and leadership specifically to the ELA department, but extending to all instructional departments.</li> </ul>
Ruemler, Kelsey	Instructional Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Participates in professional learning activities aligned with specific position requirements, and demonstrates active participation and follow-through at the school(s) of assignment.</li> </ul>
Rubianes, Carmen	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Provides consultation to teachers in the development of the Student Success Plans (SSP) and Individual Education Plans (IEP), according to individual student needs.</li> </ul>
Bobrow, Susan	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Provides consultation to teachers in the development of the Student Success Plans (SSP) and Individual Education Plans (IEP), according to individual student needs.</li> </ul>
Humphrey, Heather	Teacher, ESE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Maintains a working knowledge of local, state, and federal laws and regulations related to compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), ESEA and English Language Learners (ELLs), as</li> </ul>



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		well as guidelines pertaining to eligibility, delivery of services, individualized plan development, and MTSS.
Carberry, Jason	Psychologist	* Assists teams in the selection and implementation of research and/or evidenced-based academic and behavioral interventions to promote student progress in addition to assessing students that have been identified as in need of additional supports.
Vessella, Marisa	Math Coach	* Works collaboratively with district and school-based leadership teams, including academic coaches, to monitor fidelity and support capacity development and sustainability of MTSS implementation. * Provides intensive instructional interventions (Tier 3) to support student achievement (academic and behavioral). * Provides training and leadership to the math teachers.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Monday 7/11/2022, Ryan Nemeth

**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.*

4

**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.*

27

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

37

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

579

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

4

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

4

### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	206	194	0	0	0	0	579	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	40	36	0	0	0	0	100	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4	0	0	0	0	19	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	0	0	0	0	20	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	27	34	0	0	0	0	78	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	31	20	0	0	0	0	65	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	0	0	7	24	16	0	0	0	0	47

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/6/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	197	190	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	18	26	0	0	0	0	64
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	2	36	32	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	45	19	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	31	30	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	30	27	0	0	0	0	83
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	0	0	0	14	32	26	0	0	0	0	72

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	197	190	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	18	26	0	0	0	0	64
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	2	36	32	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	45	19	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	31	30	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	30	27	0	0	0	0	83
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	0	0	0	14	32	26	0	0	0	0	72

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

## 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	65%	55%	50%				77%	59%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						64%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%						53%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	77%	34%	36%				86%	69%	58%
Math Learning Gains	71%						78%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						70%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	67%	53%				64%	55%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	64%	58%				86%	75%	72%

### 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
06	2022					
	2019	72%	56%	16%	54%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	81%	55%	26%	52%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
08	2022					
	2019	75%	58%	17%	56%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	77%	61%	16%	55%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	88%	66%	22%	54%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
08	2022					
	2019	51%	36%	15%	46%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	85%	72%	13%	71%	14%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	67%	33%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	59%	-59%	57%	-57%

### 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	17	30	22	32	45	45	11	40			
ELL	25	29	28	39	48	45	24	54			
BLK	27	38	30	44	58	59	29	71			
HSP	55	52	34	70	70	57	50	67	95		
MUL	71	43		83	76						
WHT	78	65	37	88	73	63	75	89	94		
FRL	51	47	33	67	68	59	47	73	92		
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	27	33	33	36	50	50	19	32	92		
ELL	47	59	47	58	62	48		61			
ASN	90			100	80						
BLK	42	53	50	55	61	54	50	50	100		
HSP	64	61	41	71	70	53	54	73	93		
MUL	76	55		82	76						
WHT	77	60	40	88	73	74	65	86	99		
FRL	58	54	42	68	65	57	55	67	95		
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	38	44	40	48	54	51	20	48	71		
ELL	42	44	38	65	73	71	12		70		
ASN	100	63		100	88						
BLK	50	42	33	70	65	64	25	78			
HSP	71	63	51	79	76	71	44	83	83		
MUL	67	64		73	57						
WHT	84	68	60	91	81	73	74	88	96		
FRL	65	55	51	75	72	65	41	78	85		

**ESSA Data Review**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	650
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
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	68
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	74
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	59
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?

- Proficiency rates for ELA have declined for the past 2 years
- Proficiency rates for Math have declined for the past 2 years
- ELA/Math bottom quartile gains are at their lowest percentage for the past 5 years
- SWD not shown growth in the areas of ELA/Math/Science in the past 3 years

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

- ELA across all grade levels, particularly at the regular and intensive level
- Current 7th grade math students, particularly at the regular and intensive level



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

- Based off last year's FSA data, almost one-third of our level 3 Math students fell below proficiency in sixth grade
- Based off last year's FSA data, less than one-third of our intensive Math students made a learning gain in sixth grade
- Based off last year's FSA data, almost one-third of our level 3 ELA students fell below proficiency in sixth grade
- Based off last year's FSA data, less than one-third of our intensive ELA students made a learning gain in sixth or seventh grade

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

- 8th grade Science
- 7th grade Civics

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

- Strong standards-based instruction
- Strong monitoring system of QB data by both departments
- Strong practice for EOC and SSA using Gateway and USA Test Prep

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

- Teachers will need to identify how they will differentiate their 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.**

- ongoing Professional Development on the new B.E.S.T. standards in ELA/Math
- Professional Development opportunities to support the school-wide deliberate practice element of "Students Using Each Other to Process New Content"
- Professional Development opportunities surrounding strategies for incorporating ELL/ESE strategies into instruction

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

- Common Planning in all grade level content areas
- Professional Development sessions on Early Release Days and Virtual Learning Days
- Strategic scheduling of ELL/ESE students with tutor and case managers
- Strategic coaching support of academic coaches
- Strategic push-in/pull-out schedule of students for academic coaches

**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.**

ELA proficiency rates declined from 70% in SY21 to 65% in SY22.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If we increase teacher's knowledge, understanding, and implementation of the new ELA B.E.S.T. standards and F.A.S.T. Assessments by utilizing rigorous, data driven instruction, then we will see proficiency rates increase from 65% in SY22 to 70% in SY23.

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

1. Weekly meetings with Literacy Coach to review student data, including ELL data from System 44
2. Quarterly meetings with teachers to discuss their progress monitoring assessment data
3. Administration meetings with students for course failure
4. Monitoring of academic and non-academic data during weekly MTSS meetings
5. Meet weekly with case managers to monitor SWD data

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ryan Nemeth (nemethry@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:  
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Differentiated Instruction is adapting instruction in response to the distinct assessed skills and needs of individual learners in order to increase their access and opportunities to meet specific learning goals. The Literacy Coach will push-in and pull-out groups of students who require targeted/intensive intervention, as well as, coach any/all classroom teachers.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:  
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Differentiated instruction was selected because it contributes to the refined understanding of specific content, concepts and skills within each learner's distinct range of understanding and independent practice that improves individual abilities to successfully engage in comprehension, fluency/decoding, letter-word reading, vocabulary and writing. Criteria used in selecting this strategy involves teacher creating flexible structures and routines, instruction that is adapted through content to meet individual needs, and monitoring student progress towards goals.

**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.

1. Monitor Lesson Plans each week
2. Classroom observations using FTEM, or the ELA/Math instructional walk through tool
3. Targeted scheduling of academic coach support
4. Administrators and Academic Coaches will review work samples to ensure growth, or mastery of the standards
5. Review student data at weekly administration, MTSS, and academic coaching meetings

**Person Responsible** Ryan Nemeth (nemethry@collierschools.com)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

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

Math proficiency rates declined from 79% in SY21 to 77% in SY22.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If we increase teacher's knowledge, understanding, and implementation of the new Math B.E.S.T. standards and F.A.S.T. Assessments by utilizing rigorous, data driven instruction, then we will see proficiency rates increase from 77% in SY22 to 80% in SY23.

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

1. Weekly meetings with Math Coach to review student data
2. Quarterly meetings with teachers to discuss their progress monitoring assessment data.
3. Administration meetings with students for course failure
4. Monitoring of academic and non-academic data during weekly MTSS meetings
5. Meet weekly with case managers to monitor SWD data

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Mitchell Kinstler (kinstlmi@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

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

Explicit, systematic instruction through the use of the new instructional materials will increase student academic data as measured by quarterly Benchmark Assessments and the new Progress Monitoring Assessment. The Math Coach will push-in and pull-out groups of students who require targeted/intensive intervention, as well as, coach any/all classroom teachers.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

This strategy has been shown to be effective across all grade levels and for diverse groups of students, including students with disabilities and ELLs.

**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.

1. Monitor Lesson Plans each week
2. Classroom observations using FTEM, or the ELA/Math instructional walk through tool
3. Targeted scheduling of academic coach support
4. Administrators and Academic Coaches will review work samples to ensure growth, or mastery of the standards
5. Review student data at weekly administration, MTSS, and academic coaching meetings

**Person Responsible**

Ryan Nemeth (nemethry@collierschools.com)

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Two ESSA subgroups performed below the Federal Index (SWD and ELL). Both of these subgroups also overlap with the lowest quartile in Reading, of which had a decline in gains from FY21 to FY22. If support is provided in the area of Reading, specifically, there should be a positive impact seen in their Reading performance and overall Federal Index score

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, students in the two ESSA subgroups of SWD and ELL will show an increase of 4 points each in their Federal Index score due to a focus on increasing Reading fluency and addressing deficits

**Monitoring:**

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

1. Weekly meetings with Literacy Coach to review student data, including ELL data from System 44
2. Quarterly meetings with teachers to discuss their progress monitoring assessment data, specifically related to students within each subgroup
3. Administration meetings with students for course failure- if they within each subgroup
4. Monitoring of academic and non-academic data during weekly MTSS meetings, specifically related to students with each subgroup
5. Meet weekly with case managers to monitor SWD data

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ryan Nemeth (nemethry@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Differentiated Instruction is adapting instruction in response to the distinct assessed skills and needs of individual learners in order to increase their access and opportunities to meet specific learning goals. The Literacy Coach and Math Coach will push-in and pull-out groups of students within each identified subgroup who require targeted/intensive intervention, as well as, coach any/all classroom teachers.

**Rationale for****Evidence-based****Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**

Differentiated instruction was selected because it contributes to the refined understanding of specific content, concepts and skills within each learner's distinct range of understanding and independent practice that improves individual abilities to successfully engage in comprehension, fluency/decoding, letter-word reading, vocabulary and writing.

**Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Criteria used in selecting this strategy involves teacher creating flexible structures and routines, instruction that is adapted through content to meet individual needs, and monitoring student progress towards goals.

**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.

1. Monitor Lesson Plans each week
2. Classroom observations using FTEM, or the ELA/Math instructional walk through tool

3. Targeted scheduling of academic coach support
4. Administrators and Academic Coaches will review work samples to ensure growth, or mastery of the standards
5. Review student data at weekly administration, MTSS, and academic coaching meetings

**Person Responsible** Ryan Nemeth (nemethry@collierschools.com)

### **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.**

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 culture that value 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, parents and guardians, community members, and volunteers. Broad stakeholder groups include community colleges, local universities, social services, and business partners. As a gold rated PBIS school, Gulfview Middle has a strong Positive Behavior Support System that engages students with a token system that promotes character traits. The support system monitors academic and student support services data to ensure all students receive the support they need.

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

Ryan Nemeth, Principal- Oversees PBIS implementation

Jocelyn Schafer, Assistant Principal- Chairs the PBIS committee

Faculty of GVM- Instruct and acknowledge students who demonstrate the expectations of:

-Get Ready to Learn

-Value Yourself and Others

-Make Positive Choices

-Strive for Self-Reliance