Leon County Schools

Gilchrist Elementary School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Gilchrist Elementary School

1301 TIMBERLANE RD, Tallahassee, FL 32312

https://www.leonschools.net/gilchrist

Demographics

Principal: Scotty Crowe

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2018

2018-19 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)	28%
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: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Leon 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 Gilchrist Family of Life Long Learners" - students, teachers, staff, parents, and community members – is committed to an on-going planning process that will ensure a quality learning environment, state-of-the-art facility, and a curriculum that will be the foundation for this life long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement

Gilchrist Elementary will be the foundation for life-long learning by teaching individual skills in communicating ideas, making decisions, acting with integrity and celebrating diversity. We will seek to inspire a love of learning, a healthy self-esteem, community participation, and individual responsibility in each of our students and the entire Gilchrist family.

https://www.leonschools.net/gilchrist

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Crowe, Scotty	Principal
Principal	
Wilder, Dawn	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Austin, Tina	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Wyatt, Rosemary	Dean
Dean	
Steverson, Bevin	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	
Ross, Anna	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	

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	128	155	155	164	147	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	901
Attendance below 90 percent	8	4	9	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

63

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/21/2019

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	3	13	12	9	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	3	8	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	3	13	12	9	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	3	8	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	83%	57%	57%	82%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	54%	58%	68%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	47%	53%	52%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	87%	64%	63%	85%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	69%	63%	62%	69%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	45%	51%	58%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	82%	52%	53%	76%	52%	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	128 (0)	155 (0)	155 (0)	164 (0)	147 (0)	152 (0)	901 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	8 (3)	4 (13)	9 (12)	5 (9)	6 (7)	8 (14)	40 (58)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (3)	0 (8)	0 (7)	0 (8)	0 (26)

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)	1 (0)	3 (7)	13 (5)	17 (12)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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	85%	61%	24%	58%	27%
	2018	83%	61%	22%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	57%	23%	58%	22%
	2018	81%	58%	23%	56%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	77%	56%	21%	56%	21%
	2018	78%	57%	21%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	92%	63%	29%	62%	30%
	2018	89%	64%	25%	62%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	66%	18%	64%	20%
	2018	79%	62%	17%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	80%	61%	19%	60%	20%
	2018	85%	58%	27%	61%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	81%	54%	27%	53%	28%
	2018	75%	56%	19%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	40	32	25	48	49	42	45				
ELL	63	62		73	69						
ASN	93	90		97	85		85				
BLK	60	49	39	63	55	48	59				
HSP	90	45		85	45						
MUL	75	56		85	63						
WHT	87	67	43	92	73	70	86				
FRL	75	65	55	78	63	57	77				

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	40	25	22	47	35	16					
ELL	57			79							
ASN	94	82		97	95		91				
BLK	57	43	33	61	52	45	40				
HSP	67	77		72	46						
MUL	94	73		94	64						
WHT	87	70	61	90	71	65	83				
FRL	67	59	44	73	57	47	53				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	561

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	68
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	90
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	66
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	70
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	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	67
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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA for the lowest 25th percentile. This component decreased from 52% to 44%. This followed a trend from the previous year where the ELA learning gains decreased from 59% to 52%.

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

ELA for the lowest 25th percentile declined 8% from the previous year which is the greatest decline from the prior year.

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

Gilchrist achieved the greatest gains in Science proficiency (82%) which was 29 percentage points above the state average and ELA proficiency which was 26 percentage points above the state average. Students have traditionally scored at or above proficiency in all academic areas due to systematic quality instruction and intervention.

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

The percentage of 5th grade students achieving proficiency with score of 3 or higher on the Science FCAT increased by 6% (from 76% to 82%) compared to the previous school year. Our school focused our efforts on improving science proficiency by implementing a Science Blitz where teachers strategically targeted 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade science standards. The district provided a Science Resource Teacher to provide Science intervention and enrichment for small groups of targeted students.

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

According to EWS data, 60% of current 5th grade students who scored a 1 on 4th grade FSA ELA and/or FSA Math are students with disabilities. These students are also captured within our lowest 25%.

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

1. Reading learning gains
2. Math learning gains
3. Science proficiency
4. Students with disabilities
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Reading
Rationale	Increase the percentage of learning gains in reading made by students in the lower 25%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will increase learning gains made by the students who are in the lower 25% to at least 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Scotty Crowe (crowes2@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Identify students in the lower 35% (to capture a wider target group) using FSA data, implement research-based intervention, conduct ongoing progress monitoring to determine effectiveness of intervention, adapt instruction based on results of progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	With strategic intervention and ongoing progress monitoring, we will increase learning gains made by the students who are in the lower 35%.
Action Step	
Description	1. Progress monitor using STAR, iReady, & Wonders-based assessments 2. Offer intervention utilizing multi-sensory, research-based materials through programs such as Reading Masters, HEART, and ESE support services for students with disabilities. 3. Conduct intermittent data chats with students and teachers using progress monitoring tool. 4. Monthly data chats with teachers to review progress monitoring sheets 5. Implement MTSS process when appropriate.
Person Responsible	Anna Ross (rossa2@leonschools.net)

#2	
Title	Math
Rationale	Increase the percentage of learning gains in math made by students in the lower 25%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will increase learning gains made by the students who are in the lower 25% to at least 62%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Scotty Crowe (crowes2@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Identify students in the lower 35% (to capture a wider target group) using FSA data, implement research-based intervention, conduct ongoing progress monitoring to determine effectiveness of intervention, adapt instruction based on results of progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	With strategic intervention and ongoing progress monitoring, we will increase learning gains made by the students who are in the lower 35%.
Action Step	
Description	1. Progress monitor using FSA, iReady, and Go Math assessments. 2. Offer intervention utilizing multi-sensory, research-based materials through programs such as HEART, additional iReady sessions, and ESE support services for students with disabilities. 3. Conduct intermittent data chats with students and teachers using progress monitoring tool. 4. Monthly data chats with teachers to review progress monitoring sheets 5. Implement MTSS process when appropriate.
Person Responsible	Rosemary Wyatt (wyattr@leonschools.net)

#3	
Title	Science
Rationale	Increase the percentage of 5th grade students meeting proficiency (scoring a 3 or above) on the FCAT Science from 82% to 83%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will increase proficiency to at least 83%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Scotty Crowe (crowes2@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Identify students using standards based assessments and other teacher identified science data sources, implement research-based science intervention, conduct ongoing progress monitoring to determine effectiveness of intervention, adapt instruction based on results of progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	With strategic intervention and ongoing progress monitoring, we will increase science proficiency.
Action Step	
Description	1. Progress monitor using standards based assessments and other teacher identified science data sources. 2. Provide high quality science instruction utilizing multi-sensory, research-based materials. 3. Offer high quality intervention programs such as Science HEART for ESE students. 4. Implement a 3rd grade Science Lab designed to build the foundation of science skills with the goal of growing the science lab model to incorporate other grade levels. 5. Conduct a "science blitz" in the spring to review 3rd and 4th grade science standards through mini-lessons.
Person Responsible	Dawn Wilder (wilderd@leonschools.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)

Gilchrist will address remaining school wide improvement priorities such as school safety, community partnerships, relationship building, improving communication, professional development opportunities for teachers and staff, and innovative STEM initiatives. These priorities will be discussed, planned, and approved through School Improvement Committees, SITE, and SAC Committees.

Part V: Budget

1	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Reading**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Math**	**$0.00**
3	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Science**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$10,153.71**