Gilchrist Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide 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: 8/6/2018

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)	28%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: A (72%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Crowe, Scotty	Principal	The Principal leads the school community in developing, communicating, and implementing the school's vision. Principals assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities. The leadership team sets high expectations for teaching and learning. The leadership team will support initiatives which foster leadership, shared decision making and a continuous improvement model. The leadership team will identify resources to increase data driven decision making to support high quality instruction. School personnel share leadership responsibilities and participate in decision making that advances the school's mission, Collectively, the team will attend grade level meetings, implement data driven intervention programs, offer onsite professional development, and visit classrooms to observe instruction and provide feedback
Wilder, Dawn	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal supports the Principal in promoting the vision and implementing the mission of the school. The leadership team sets high expectations for teaching and learning. The leadership team will support initiatives which foster leadership, shared decision making and a continuous improvement model. The leadership team will identify resources to increase data driven decision making to support high quality instruction. School personnel share leadership responsibilities and participate in decision making that advances the school's mission, Collectively, the team will attend grade level meetings, implement data driven intervention programs, offer onsite professional development, and visit classrooms to observe instruction and provide feedback.
Wyatt, Rosemary	Dean	The Dean supports the Principal in promoting the vision and implementing the mission of the school. The leadership team sets high expectations for teaching and learning. The leadership team will support initiatives which foster leadership, shared decision making and a continuous improvement model. The leadership team will identify resources

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		to increase data driven decision making to support high quality instruction. School personnel share leadership responsibilities and participate in decision making that advances the school's mission, Collectively, the team will attend grade level meetings, implement data driven intervention programs, offer onsite professional development, and visit classrooms to observe instruction and provide feedback.
Mitchell, Cheryl	Dean	The Dean supports the Principal in promoting the vision and implementing the mission of the school. The leadership team sets high expectations for teaching and learning. The leadership team will support initiatives which foster leadership, shared decision making and a continuous improvement model. The leadership team will identify resources to increase data driven decision making to support high quality instruction. School personnel share leadership responsibilities and participate in decision making that advances the school's mission, Collectively, the team will attend grade level meetings, implement data driven intervention programs, offer onsite professional development, and visit classrooms to observe instruction and provide feedback.
Steverson, Bevin	Guidance Counselor	The Guidance Counselor supports the Principal in promoting the vision and implementing the mission of the school. The leadership team sets high expectations for teaching and learning. The leadership team will support initiatives which foster leadership, shared decision making and a continuous improvement model. The leadership team will identify resources to increase data driven decision making to support high quality instruction. School personnel share leadership responsibilities and participate in decision making that advances the school's mission, Collectively, the team will attend grade level meetings, implement data driven intervention programs, offer onsite professional development, and visit classrooms to observe instruction and provide feedback.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ross, Anna	Instructional Coach	The Instructional (Reading) Coach supports the Principal in promoting the vision and implementing the mission of the school. The leadership team sets high expectations for teaching and learning. The leadership team will support initiatives which foster leadership, shared decision making and a continuous improvement model. The leadership team will identify resources to increase data driven decision making to support high quality instruction. School personnel share leadership responsibilities and participate in decision making that advances the school's mission, Collectively, the team will attend grade level meetings, implement data driven intervention programs, offer onsite professional development, and visit classrooms to observe instruction and provide feedback.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/6/2018, Scotty Crowe

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
62

Demographic Data

2020-21 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 Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: A (72%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Jeff Sewell](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

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	113	132	137	140	152	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	813
Attendance below 90 percent	9	46	18	20	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	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	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	2	5	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/8/2020

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	
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		
Course failure in ELA or Math	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

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	

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	
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		
Course failure in ELA or Math	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

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	

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	
	(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.

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%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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
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	
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
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 on the 2018-2019 FSA was ELA for the bottom 25%. 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%. However, on the winter benchmark of the 2019-2020 STAR Reading assessment, 60% of students in the bottom 35% were proficient.

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

The data component on the 2018-2019 FSA that showed the greatest decline was ELA for the bottom 25th percentile. This component declined 8% from the previous 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

On the 2018-2019 FSA, 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?

On the 2018-2019 FCAT Science, the percentage of 5th grade students achieving proficiency with a score of 3 or higher 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. Our resource teachers in conjunction with our general education teachers provided Science intervention and enrichment for all students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

According to EWS data, 100% of current 4th and 5th graders who scored a 1 on the 3rd or 4th grade FSA ELA and/or FSA Math are students with disabilities. These students are also captured within our lowest 25%. The students with disabilities subgroup is the only subgroup that did not meet the Federal Index threshold of above 41%.

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on a data review of the 2018-2019 FSA, we identified a critical need in the area of ELA learning gains made by students in the bottom 25%.
Measureable Outcome:	If at least 95% of our students are assessed on the 2020-2021 FSA ELA, we will increase learning gains made by students in the bottom 25% to at least 45%. Of the students assessed in STAR Reading, we will increase proficiency made by students in the bottom 35% to at least 61%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scotty Crowe (crowes2@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Identify students in the lower 35% (in an effort to capture a wider target group) using FSA data from the most recently tested year, 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 Steps to Implement

Progress monitor using STAR, iReady, & Wonders-based assessments

Person Responsible	Anna Ross (rossa2@leonschools.net)

Offer intervention utilizing multi-sensory, research-based materials through programs such as Reading Masters, HEART, and ESE support services for students with disabilities.

Person Responsible	Rosemary Wyatt (wyattr@leonschools.net)

Conduct intermittent data chats with at-risk students (students in the bottom 35%) using progress monitoring tools.

Person Responsible	Anna Ross (rossa2@leonschools.net)

Conduct monthly data chats with grade level teachers to review updated progress monitoring information on all students and match students with the appropriate level of intervention based on their specific needs.

Person Responsible	Scotty Crowe (crowes2@leonschools.net)

Implement the MTSS process when students do not appear to be making progress despite targeted intervention in the area of ELA.

Person Responsible	Rosemary Wyatt (wyattr@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on a data analysis of 2018-2019 FSA data, we identified a critical need in the area of learning gains in Math made by students in the bottom 25%.
Measureable Outcome:	If at least 95% of our students are assessed on the 2020-2021 FSA Math, we will increase learning gains made by students in the bottom 25% to at least 62%. Of the students assessed in iReady Math, at least 62% of the bottom 35% of students will make learning gains through the fall, winter, and spring benchmark diagnostics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scotty Crowe (crowes2@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Identify students in the bottom 35th percentile (to capture a wider target group) using FSA data from the most recently tested year, implement research-based intervention, conduct ongoing progress monitoring to determine the effectiveness of the 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 bottom 35th percentile

Action Steps to Implement	
Progress monitor using FSA, iReady, and Go Math assessments.	
Person Responsible	Anna Ross (rossa2@leonschools.net)
Offer intervention utilizing multi-sensory, research-based materials through programs such as HEART, additional iReady sessions, and ESE support services for students with disabilities.	
Person Responsible	Rosemary Wyatt (wyattr@leonschools.net)
Conduct intermittent data chats with students using progress monitoring tools.	
Person Responsible	Anna Ross (rossa2@leonschools.net)
Conduct monthly data chats with grade level teachers to review updated progress monitoring information on all students and match students with the appropriate intervention based on their specific needs.	
Person Responsible	Scotty Crowe (crowes2@leonschools.net)
Implement the MTSS process when students do not appear to be making progress despite targeted intervention in the area of Math.	
Person Responsible	Rosemary Wyatt (wyattr@leonschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on a data analysis of 2018-2019 FCAT Science data, we identified a goal of increasing the percentage of 5th grade students meeting proficiency on the FCAT Science.
Measureable Outcome:	If at least 95% of our 5th grade students are assessed on the 2020-2021 FCAT Science, we will increase proficiency to at least 83%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anna Ross (rossa2@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 instructional practices based on the results of progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With strategic intervention and ongoing progress monitoring, we will increase science proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Progress monitor using standards based assessments and other teacher identified science data sources.

Person Responsible	Anna Ross (rossa2@leonschools.net)

Provide high quality science instruction utilizing multi-sensory, research-based materials.

Person Responsible	Dawn Wilder (wilderd@leonschools.net)

Offer high quality intervention programs such as Science HEART for ESE students.

Person Responsible	Rosemary Wyatt (wyattr@leonschools.net)

Conduct a "Science Blitz" focused on reviewing 3rd and 4th grade science standards through mini-lessons.

Person Responsible	Dawn Wilder (wilderd@leonschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on a data review of the 2018-2019 FSA, we identified a critical need in the area of ELA learning gains and proficiency made by students with disabilities.
Measureable Outcome:	If at least 95% of our students in this subgroup are assessed on the 2020-2021 FSA ELA, we will increase the Federal Index Score for students with disabilities from 40% to at least 42%. We will increase proficiency for students with disabilities who are assessed in STAR Reading to at least 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scotty Crowe (crowes2@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will analyze data to identify barriers and initiate improvement strategies to increase learning gains and proficiency scores for students with disabilities. Our students with disabilities also fall into the bottom 35% as evidenced by 2018-2019 FSA data and 2019-2020 progress monitoring data; we will implement research-based intervention, conduct ongoing progress monitoring to determine the effectiveness of ESE interventions and accommodations, and adapt instruction in both the general and special education settings based on results of progress monitoring and progress toward IEP goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With strategic intervention and ongoing progress monitoring, we will increase learning gains and proficiency made by students with disabilities which will increase our Federal Index score in this subgroup.

Action Steps to Implement

Progress monitor using STAR, iReady, curriculum-based assessments, & ongoing IEP goal progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Anna Ross (rossa2@leonschools.net)

Offer intervention utilizing multi-sensory, research-based materials through programs such as Reading Masters, HEART, and ESE support services for students with disabilities.

Person Responsible Rosemary Wyatt (wyattr@leonschools.net)

Conduct monthly data chats with grade level and ESE teachers to review and share updated progress monitoring information on students with disabilities to create strong accountability and high expectations.

Person Responsible Scotty Crowe (crowes2@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Gilchrist will address the remaining school wide improvement priorities such as culture and environment related to school safety and social emotional learning. We will address school safety specifically related to COVID-19 by strategically planning, adjusting, and communicating our "School Reopening/COVID-19 Safety Plan" to our stakeholder groups. Our School Reopening Plan addresses COVID-19 safety and hygiene protocols, COVID-19 reporting and compliance, daily schedules & operations, first day/first week safety plans, emergency drills, and facility maintenance. We will address school safety specifically related to social emotional learning by promoting relationship and community building through use of the Sanford Harmony Program. We will offer professional development opportunities for both brick and mortar and digital academy teachers focused on curriculum building, standards mapping, activity and intervention planning. We will also offer professional development opportunities in Canvas, the county adopted learning management system, virtual meeting platforms such as Teams and Zoom, providing ESE, 504, & ELL accommodations in both the brick and mortar and digital learning environments, and leadership skill building among teacher leaders. These priorities will be discussed, planned, and approved through the School Improvement committees, SITE and SAC committees.

Part IV: 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 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, 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The larger Gilchrist community embraces and embodies high expectations for student achievement, faculty and staff cohesiveness, leadership opportunities, community building, trust, respect, safety, and pride in our school. School improvement strategies build on the vision and mission by explicitly outlining our definition of school success and providing a road map for how we can get there. Gilchrist addresses building a positive school culture and environment by fostering a shared understanding of our mission and vision with important stakeholder groups. Gilchrist includes stakeholders in school wide initiatives and seeks the expertise of a broader group of stakeholders for input and shared decision-making. Gilchrist is a SITE-based decision-making school and engages an active SAC committee. Our leadership team vets ideas and initiatives through these two important stakeholder groups to bolster family-school-community partnerships. Gilchrist has developed a communication framework which includes our list-serv, weekly newsletters, social media, website, email, mail-outs, and

advertisements that reach our students, teachers, parents, and larger community. This level of communication allows stakeholders to engage in the process of embracing our school improvement strategies which in turn reinforces our positive school culture and environment.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

		Part V: Budget	
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00