

Manatee County Public Schools

B.D. Gullett Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

B.D. Gullett Elementary School

12125 44TH AVE E, Bradenton, FL 34211

<http://www.edline.net/pages/sdmcgullettes>

Demographics

Principal: Todd Richardson

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2017

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	32%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: B 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	

Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	N/A
<p>* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.</p>	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of B. D. Gullett Elementary School is to inspire all learners to dream, achieve, and develop a love of learning through curiosity, commitment, and compassion.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision of Gullett Elementary is for each student to achieve full potential in his or her academic, creative, personal, physical, moral and spiritual development.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Richardson, Todd	Principal	
Mallett, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
Barnes, Brittani	Teacher, K-12	
Schroer, Toni	Assistant Principal	
Gierhart, Julie	Administrative Support	
McCaw, Lauren	Administrative Support	
Santora, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Angel, Emmie	Teacher, K-12	Participant
Bock, Sarah	Teacher, ESE	
Connor, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	
Durkee, Lee Ann	Teacher, K-12	
Whitfield, Kelli	Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	161	160	184	213	184	171	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1073
Attendance below 90 percent	11	4	5	6	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	1	8	7	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	12	13	12	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	18	19	14	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

58

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/22/2019

Prior Year - 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
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	12	22	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	1	24	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	10	12	3	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

Prior Year - 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
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	12	22	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	1	24	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	10	12	3	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	76%	52%	57%	79%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	57%	58%	67%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	55%	53%	61%	47%	48%
Math Achievement	80%	63%	63%	79%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains	73%	68%	62%	77%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	53%	51%	64%	47%	47%
Science Achievement	74%	48%	53%	74%	49%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	161 (0)	160 (0)	184 (0)	213 (0)	184 (0)	171 (0)	1073 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	11 (0)	4 (15)	5 (12)	6 (22)	9 (13)	4 (12)	39 (74)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	8 (0)	7 (1)	4 (0)	5 (2)	4 (4)	29 (7)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 (0)	12 (0)	13 (1)	12 (1)	15 (24)	13 (19)	68 (45)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (12)	18 (14)	14 (13)	47 (39)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	51%	22%	58%	15%
	2018	79%	49%	30%	57%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	56%	19%	58%	17%
	2018	74%	51%	23%	56%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	75%	52%	23%	56%	19%
	2018	78%	52%	26%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	60%	22%	62%	20%
	2018	70%	56%	14%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	65%	13%	64%	14%
	2018	79%	61%	18%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	76%	60%	16%	60%	16%
	2018	80%	58%	22%	61%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	71%	48%	23%	53%	18%
	2018	72%	49%	23%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	43	45	44	46	53	67	65				
ELL	51	55	52	58	68	53	47				
ASN	89	56		83	75						
BLK	52	68	67	52	59	42	60				
HSP	63	56	56	67	71	57	55				
MUL	72	69		79	75						
WHT	81	70	55	86	75	63	84				
FRL	61	63	59	62	63	50	58				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	63	67	65	57	70	58					
ELL	59	67	64	68	67						
ASN	88			81							
BLK	45	60	73	49	65	75	50				
HSP	66	60	57	71	66	43	61				
MUL	95	77		75	54						
WHT	86	70	62	86	84	76	78				
FRL	64	55	60	65	65	55	68				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	547

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
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	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	76
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	57
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	61
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	74
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Native American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Native American 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	73
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

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends

Our data component that showed the lowest performance was in our Learning Gains categories. In this we have our lowest quartile learning gains, as well as our students scoring 4's and 5's who have to be considered in this category. Both groups need small group differentiation addressing both students who are not at proficiency as well as students who are above level. All groups need to be differentiated. We also noticed that our students with disabilities were showing 43% proficiency in ELA.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

The greatest decline was in our lowest quartile learning gains for both ELA and Math. Attendance was a big factor for our lowest quartile students. There were also behavior concerns of the lowest quartile. Engagement during class and motivation to learn has been a concern throughout all grade levels. Many of our students in the lowest quartile tended to show signs of having a fixed mind set. Students' perception of themselves effects their willingness to be open to new learning. Many of our lowest quartile students were less willing to take risks in class and with their learning.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

Our greatest gap is positive from the state average. The state averages for ELA is 57% proficiency. Our ELA average is 73% proficiency. The state averages for Math is 62%. Our Math proficiency average is 80%. The state averages for Science is 53% and our average proficiency is 71%. Our greatest gap is above the average. It is in Science and Math on the positive side. We contribute this gap and our trends to our high performing students in all areas. Our teachers continue to strive to use best practices in instruction and meet the rigor of the standards in their instruction. Our teachers seek opportunities to monitor data and be responsive to student needs. We also often offer professional development and use funds to purchase research based materials to support instruction.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our Math Achievement Proficiency increased from 79% to 80% proficient. We implemented the MAFS curriculum. We also used heterogeneous math grouping in third grade classrooms, where as in the past homogeneous grouping was implemented. This grade level showed the greatest gains. There was an emphasis throughout the school to use more differentiated small groups during Math instruction after a whole group introduction to the standard being taught. We offered teachers professional development in small group math instruction. Teachers discussed and shared this vertically among teams.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Our potential areas of concern are increasing learning gains in both reading and math and developing students socially and emotionally.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year

1. Social Emotional Growth of students
2. Learning Gains in ELA (especially students with disabilities)
3. Learning Gains in Math (especially students with disabilities)
4. Learning Gains of Lowest 25% in ELA (especially students with disabilities)
5. Learning Gains of Lowest 25% in Math (especially students with disabilities)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increasing learning gains in the lowest quartile in ELA (with a focus on our students with disabilities)
Rationale	We noticed a decrease from 2018 (61%) to 2019 (56%) of learning gains in our lowest quartile. This was especially noticed in the subgroup of students with disabilities who showed 43% learning gains. This is why we feel that this is a group we need to continue to focus. Our school is significantly out performing the state average for proficiency. However the ELA learning gains in our lowest quartile is not showing as significant of a difference. The state Lowest Quartile Learning gains for ELA is at 53%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to increase our learning gains in the lowest quartile by 5% (from 56%-61%).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group differentiated instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We are better able to meet individual students' needs through an increase in small group instruction that is differentiated and tailored to address and support students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a schedule to support inclusion for our SWD students for additional support in an inclusion classroom where a General Education teacher is being supported by a VE Resource teacher during ELA blocks. 2. Gather data (multiple sources) on each student 3. Create a differentiated plan for meeting with students (daily/weekly) 4. Provide professional development around differentiation/ scaffolding for students during 1/2 day PD quarterly for grade level teams. 5. Evaluate students' progress and adjust strategies as needed.
Person Responsible	Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

#2	
Title	Increasing learning gains in the lowest quartile in Math
Rationale	We noticed a decrease from 2018 (77%) to 2019 (73%) of learning gains in Math. This was especially noticed in our lowest quartile which decreased from 64% in 2018 to 57% in 2019. This is why we feel that this is a group on which we need to continue to focus. Our school is significantly out performing the state average for proficiency. However the Math learning gains in our lowest quartile students are not showing as significant of a difference.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will increase our overall Learning Gains in Math by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Toni Schroer (schroert@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Math small group differentiation and intervention groups. Our new Math series, Envision, has curriculum that supports this growth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We feel that small group differentiated instruction can target not only our lowest quartile students, but also our students who are above scoring proficiency. Our ESE inclusion model provides support for our students in the ESE inclusion classroom with support from ESE resource teachers.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administer the iReady diagnostic, plus another source of data collection to include beginning of the year screening tools and beginning of the year assessments. 2. Analyze data to determine small group needs. Fourth and fifth grade will analyze FSA data as well as other data sources. PLC meetings in grade levels will be used to analyze data and determine trends in data. 3. Develop a Professional Development plan focusing on small group scaffolded instruction through our cross grade level Math Committee. 4. Utilize the Envision Math curriculum and provide support on instruction through the Math Committee. 5. Purchase Math in Practice for the professional library (one set across the grade levels). 6. Schedule half day professional development days by grade level to include substitutes.
Person Responsible	Brittani Barnes (barnesb@manateeschools.net)

#3

Title Social and Emotional growth of our students

Rationale We noticed that our students whose behavior required a suspension from school increased from 7 (2018) to 29 (2019). We feel that if students feel more of a sense of community and an increased awareness of how their choices impact others, they will feel more responsible in their contributions to a safe learning environment.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve We will decrease the number of suspensions by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy Teachers will conduct morning meetings using the Morning Meeting format from Responsive Classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy The Morning Meeting is an engaging way to build a strong sense of community and set students up for success socially and academically.

Action Step

1. Purchase Morning Meeting books for each staff member.
2. Design a professional development discussion through Schoology.
3. Implement team based planning and discussion of the morning meeting strategies.
4. Plan as teams for the morning meeting.
5. Share ideas at faculty meetings focused on each component of the Morning Meeting.

Description

Person Responsible Toni Schroer (schroert@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

N/A

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

N/A

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Increasing learning gains in the lowest quartile in ELA (with a focus on our students with disabilities)	\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Increasing learning gains in the lowest quartile in Math	\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Social and Emotional growth of our students	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00