
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	12
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 8/7/2017

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	16%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (71%) 2020-21: (65%) 2018-19: A (69%) 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	N/A

* 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 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

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
Richardson, Todd	Principal	
Gierhart, Julie	Assistant Principal	
McCaw, Lauren	Other	Student Support Specialist
Killian, Kathryn	Other	Student Support Specialist
Wardell, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Mallett, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
Barnes, Brittani	Teacher, K-12	
Bellew, Vanessa	Teacher, K-12	
McDaniel, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	
Anderson, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Rueping, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/7/2017, Todd Richardson

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.*

6

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

72

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,107

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

5

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	170	183	232	209	223	244	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1261
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	26	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	11	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	4	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/22/2022

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	145	213	178	217	220	183	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1156
Attendance below 90 percent	12	9	7	15	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	10	3	12	13	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	11	4	7	9	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	25	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	16	25	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	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	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	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	145	213	178	217	220	183	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1156
Attendance below 90 percent	12	9	7	15	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	10	3	12	13	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	11	4	7	9	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	25	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	16	25	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	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	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	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	75%	55%	56%	74%			76%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	60%	61%	61%			66%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	52%	52%	45%			56%	55%	53%
Math Achievement	84%	65%	60%	79%			80%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	74%	66%	64%	68%			73%	68%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	55%	55%	58%			57%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	72%	53%	51%	68%			74%	48%	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	73%	51%	22%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	75%	56%	19%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2022					
	2019	75%	52%	23%	56%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

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	82%	60%	22%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	78%	65%	13%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2022					
	2019	76%	60%	16%	60%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	71%	48%	23%	53%	18%
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	38	49	55	51	55	47	29				
ELL	77	71		75	64	50	60				
ASN	87	80		90	87						
BLK	33	47		57	53		73				
HSP	75	64	45	81	71	56	67				
MUL	80	84		90	84		86				
WHT	76	72	63	85	74	67	72				
FRL	57	62	53	64	64	54	57				
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	35	42	42	49	68	67	37				
ELL	71			74							
ASN	61			78							
BLK	41			47							
HSP	71	57	30	71	57		62				
MUL	89			96							
WHT	75	61	52	81	71	64	68				
FRL	53	52	30	59	61	47	49				
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	46	47	44	51	65	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				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
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	93
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	587

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	86
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	53
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	69
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	85
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

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?

Data indicates that there are high levels of proficiency in the area of ELA, Math and Science.

2018-2019:

- ELA Proficiency - 76
- Math Proficiency - 80
- Science Proficiency - 74

2020-2021:

- ELA Proficiency - 74
- Math Proficiency - 79
- Science Proficiency - 68

2021-2022:

- ELA Proficiency - 75
- Math Proficiency - 84
- Science Proficiency - 71

Data also indicates that our lowest quartile in ELA and Math are showing growth, but continue to need various levels of support through differentiated instruction. Because Gullett has a wide range of students in the lowest quartile, students scoring proficient and above, there is a need for accelerated instruction

and various differentiation models.

2018-2019
 ELA LQ - 56
 Math LQ - 57

2020-2021
 ELA LQ - 45
 Math - LQ - 58

2021-2022
 ELA LQ - 58
 Math LQ - 63

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

Our data component that showed the lowest performance was our Learning Gains categories. In this we have our lowest quartile learning gains, as well as our students scoring 4s and 5s who have to be considered in this category.

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

In addition for the need for small group differentiation addressing both students who are not at proficiency as well as students who are above level is necessary. Due to Florida changing their state assessment, the focus this year will solely be on proficiency, however Gullett will continue to provide supports to students needing to show growth.

Manatee county has begun implementation of the new B.E.S.T. benchmark/standards and students will transition from paper based testing to computer based testing. These are factors that will be addressed through collaborative planning and effective use of new instructional materials. Administration will monitor the use of the new curriculum and provide feedback for growth. We will use student achievement data throughout the school year to plan/facilitate coaching and PD.

New actions to consider and address for improvement are instructional groups based on intensive, on-level and acceleration. Differentiated groups for ELA and Math will be expected for grades 3-5 as well as grades K-2 for additional reading time. The need for support for our growing SWD population is being addressed with co-teaching classrooms and support.

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

According to our 2021-2022 state assessment, our ELA proficiency increased from 74% to 75%, our Math proficiency increased from 79% to 84% and our Science proficiency increased from 68% to 71%. We previously implemented Acaletics with our 4th and 5th graders and saw tremendous growth. There is an emphasis throughout the school to use more differentiated instructional groups in math. The use of more strategic differentiation paired with collaborative instructional planning and PD, allowed for a 5% increase in math proficiency.

2020-2021:
 ELA Proficiency - 74
 Math Proficiency - 79
 Science Proficiency - 68

2021-2022:

ELA Proficiency - 75

Math Proficiency - 84

Science Proficiency - 71

According to our 2021-2022 state assessment, our ELA bottom quartile showed a 13% growth, our Math bottom quartile showed a 5% growth.

2020-2021

ELA LQ - 45

Math - LQ - 58

2021-2022

ELA LQ - 58

Math LQ - 63

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

Contributing factors to growth during the past state assessments were daily small group differentiation in ELA and Math acaletics groups. Regularly scheduled data meetings to review student data at each grade level allowed for instructional groups to be fluid.

Current Acaletics curriculum facilitated in the growth in math proficiency.

Continued emphasis throughout the school to use more differentiated small groups during math instruction after a whole group introduction to the standard being taught.

Offering teachers professional development in small group math instruction. Teachers discussed and shared this vertically among teams.

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

Continued instruction in small groups that remain fluid throughout the year. Continuation of Acaletics curriculum for math in 4th and 5th grades and the addition of Acaletics in 3rd grade.

Continued Acaletics and WOZ/labs for added science instruction.

Professional development for teachers, face to face and through Schoology.

Peer walks for teachers.

Acceleration and Traditional math in 3rd - 5th grades.

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.

Collaborative planning with embedded professional development.

Professional Development focusing on best practices in Math and Science and new curriculum.

Science/Math Committee - allowing for more vertical grade level support and school-wide family events.

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

Additional Professional Development, monthly, will be provided for teachers/staff focusing on ELA, Math and Science instruction. While some school and district PD will be required, we will be providing staff with opportunities for optional PD.

Administration will be meeting at least monthly with Team Leaders to discuss data and will also meet weekly with grade level teams to relay any relevant information related to the SOP, student data and Professional Development opportunities.

Math and Science Committee to support instruction school-wide.

Acaletics 3rd -5th grades.

Acceleration and Traditional Math instruction in 3rd - 5th grades.

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 Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Differentiation of instruction for students is key to meeting the needs of the students at different times. Effective instructional practice is an important avenue to learning gains. By using current formative data collected by teachers, the needs of individual students and whole class can be measured to determine instructional pathways in all subject areas. 2021-2022 School Data reflects 75% proficiency in ELA according to FSA data. Teachers can use data to determine the next steps for whole group instruction as well as forming flexible small groups to preview new learning, reteaching information, accelerate instruction or provide an avenue for continued practice with current learning. Our staff will rely on differentiation to ensure that students meet proficiency in ELA, as well as continue to focus on learning gains. Gullett provides differentiation in ELA for students K-5, allowing students to be identified for additional ELA instruction through acceleration, on level or intensive supports. Gullett offers a co-teach model at various grade levels to provide more small group instruction throughout the day. This model is designed to meet the needs of students with various learning needs. The differentiation provided throughout the co-teach model allows for more frequent instruction in small group. Gullett provides mainstreaming opportunities to K-5 VE students and work to make sure students are exposed to core curriculum in the general education setting as appropriate. Differentiation of instruction will be crucial in the success of student proficiency and our school.

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

By May 2023, 78% of our students will be proficient in ELA, as evidenced by the Florida Assessment for Student Thinking (FAST).

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

Grade level data meetings occur monthly with administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will use a variety of quantitative data tools to determine the instructional needs of the students. This formative data will be collected in a variety of ways. Our teachers will administer FAST 3x per year as a progress monitoring too and quarterly benchmark

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

assessments provided by the Manatee County School District based on the standards taught during the quarter in ELA. Tri-Annually, Jan Richardson Assessment will be administered. Teachers will flexibly group students to meet the different needs based on this data. Differentiation will occur throughout the grade levels during additional ELA instruction (FNC or WIN time). These differentiated groups will meet the needs of our students who are needing acceleration, on-level or intensive supports.

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

Knowing not all learners are the same is a fundamental factor to teaching and learning. Differentiation of instruction ensures that students will be receiving the right instruction at the right time. Using on-going data collection is instrumental in forming these hypotheses to better support learners. Jan Richardson, Fountas and Pinnell, Marzano, Fisher, Frey and Hattie's research supports our selection of this strategy.

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.

Continue to offer professional development opportunities for teachers to support differentiated instruction in ELA. The ELA PD will continue to focus on guided reading instruction through three steps: (1) Assessment, (2) design, and (3) implementation. On-going PD with our new curriculum and standards will be provided to teachers throughout the year.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

Plan and conduct data meetings to analyze data for tiered interventions.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

Plan grade level opportunities for data driven instructional planning quarterly (collaborative planning).

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

Offer coaching cycles and modeling for teachers to improve differentiated instruction efficacy based on teacher observation information.

Person Responsible Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

Develop coaching cycles with teachers to improve differentiated instruction efficacy.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

Provide support (monthly meetings) for new teachers to Gullett and to our School District, focusing on curriculum, best practices, and other classroom supports.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

Provide support for teachers on collecting data onto spreadsheets to use for planning purposes. Teacher will use School City as a data collection resource for FAST, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments and Jan Richardson Data.

Person Responsible Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

Provide weekly grade level support by joining grade level team meetings.

Person Responsible Todd Richardson (richardt@manateeschools.net)

Collaboration and PD provided to Co-Teachers, Inclusion teacher and ESE teachers monthly.

Person Responsible Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

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

Providing effective re-teaching and activating prior knowledge to facilitate the delivery of future core instruction is an important avenue to student proficiency. Gullett's math data shows 84% proficiency according to 2021-2022 FSA data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2023, 85% of our students will be proficient in Math, as evidenced by the Florida Assessment for Student Thinking (FAST).

Monitoring:

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

Our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade teachers teach in differentiated math classes according to student levels. Students are placed in math classes based on student performance on a variety of previous assessments. General education math classes and accelerated math classes are offered for 3rd - 5th grade students.

Our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade teachers are also instructing students in their acaletics groups, based on instructional level. These acaletics groups are fluid and changes based on updated data throughout the year. These acaletics groups allow teachers to pre-teach, reteach and review math skills covered throughout the year.

Gullett offers a co-teach model at various grade levels to provide more small group instruction throughout the day. This model is designed to meet the needs of students with various learning needs. The differentiation provided throughout the co-teach model allows for more frequent instruction in small group.

Gullett provides mainstreaming opportunities to K-5 VE students and work to make sure students are exposed to core curriculum in the general education setting as appropriate.

Differentiation of instruction will be crucial in the success of student proficiency and our school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The Math courses and acaletics groups provide highly effective and engaging math problems that align with grade level benchmarks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this

Knowing not all learners are the same is a fundamental factor to teaching and learning. Differentiation of instruction ensures that students will be receiving the right instruction at the right time. Using on-going data collection is instrumental in forming these hypotheses to better support learners. Jan Richardson, Fountas

specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

and Pinnell, Marzano, Fisher, Frey and Hattie's research supports our selection of this strategy.

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.

Continue to offer professional development for teachers to support differentiated instruction in Math.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

Plan and conduct data meetings to analyze data for accelerated courses and general/on-level math courses.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

Plan grade level opportunities for data driven instructional planning quarterly (collaborative planning).

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

Develop coaching cycles with teachers to improve differentiated instruction efficacy.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

Offer coaching cycles and modeling for teachers to improve differentiated instruction efficacy based on teacher observation information.

Person Responsible Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

Group ESE students into identified co-teach and inclusion classrooms and provide appropriate supports into these classrooms to ensure differentiation.

Person Responsible Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

Provide weekly grade level support by joining grade level team meetings.

Person Responsible Todd Richardson (richardt@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

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

Providing effective re-teaching and activating prior knowledge to facilitate the delivery of future core instruction is an important avenue to learning gains. Gullett's 2021-2022 Science data reflects that 71% proficient in this content area.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

By May 2023, 75% of our students will be proficient in Science, as evidenced by the Florida Statewide Science Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly team planning/meetings.
Collaborative Planning.
Grade level data meetings.
District Science Benchmark Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The WOZ science resources are specific to Next Generation Sunshine State Science Standards, helping students learn more science topics than those included in the Next Generation Science Standards. They emphasize doing science, giving the learner the opportunity to pose questions and discover answers through project-based, hands-on experience. The standards call for students to form hypotheses, test theories, and analyze data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Utilizing the WOZ materials make it possible for students to experience what scientist do to investigate the natural world and what engineers do to design and build systems. These project-based lessons and materials promote scientific inquiry, engaging students in practices that establish foundational knowledge of core scientific ideas and build on that foundation to ensure a cohesive understanding of science.

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.

Establish a Science Committee focusing on science curriculum and lateral planning.

Person Responsible Rachel Mallett (mallettr@manateeschools.net)

Implementation and Professional Development opportunities for teachers focusing on the WOZ program.

Person Responsible Rachel Mallett (mallettr@manateeschools.net)

Lateral planning during quarterly and grade level collaborative planning half days.

Person Responsible Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.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.

At Gullett Elementary, we believe that communication and collaboration is the key to building a supportive and appreciative environment in which to work and learn. Our goal is to involve all stakeholders in data driven decision-making to benefit the school as a whole. Our staff was invited to assist in the writing of our School Improvement Plan. All staff is involved in the implementation of the plan. Professional Development for all of our staff is available through Schoology and/or in person. Teachers will write their PDP goals to align with our SIP goals.

Each year we hold elections for our SAC board and have always in the past had well attended SAC meetings. Traditionally, our SAC board has worked hard to hear the voices of the community. They bring perspective and viewpoints to our SAC meetings so that as a school community we are able to work together to solve issues and concerns. Our SAC will also be involved in the approval of the SIP for our school. Our PTO is also involved in ensuring the successful implementation of our SIP through raising funds to purchase necessary supplements to our curriculum and learning environment.

The same philosophy of teamwork holds true for our staff. We strive to provide timely communication to our staff of current trends using both qualitative and quantitative data. Our instructional leadership team collaborates with our administrative team to assist in decision making and communication. Our administrative team is readily available and transparent with all stakeholders. Our culture is one of collaboration and trust.

Grade levels meet monthly to review current academic data and discuss interventions to meet the individual needs of students. Our MTSS team meets each Tuesday to ensure that individual students are receiving appropriate interventions to help them grow academically as well as in life.

Overall, the staff, the students, and their families continue to provide a supportive environment focused on the health and safety of all. Our staff and families have truly bonded together to ensure a culture of appreciation and success at Gullett. Whether through Life Skills groups with counselors, family events, Morning Meetings the school social media accounts, our Staff Glowing Gators or our Sunshine Committee, we are continuously building a positive school culture and environments.

Gullett Elementary is implementing SPARKS school-wide. Our staff has been trained on and is implementing SPARK strategies to foster a positive culture of school-wide and classroom expectations

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

Our school has developed and maintained partnerships with many local organizations in the community who continue to provide resources to support student achievement. Our Assistant Principal, along with our PTO appropriate and work with business partners to see if they are willing to support our school.

Each quarter, we hold assemblies for all grade levels. Students are recognized in several categories including, but not limited to academic achievement, displaying behaviors that match the Character Trait of the Month and earning Top Gator, through our schoolwide SPARK/PBS. We receive coupons from our Business Partners to reward our students quarterly.

Our PTO is an integral part of our school and maintains a website and social media profile for parents to access. PTO recruits parents to help with events and attend monthly PTO and SAC meetings. Parents are very active in our school through volunteering, leading and participating in events that support our students and school.