

Collier County Public Schools

# Golden Gate Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Golden Gate Elementary School

4911 20TH PL SW, Naples, FL 34116

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Mary Ann Caseres**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/7/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (61%) 2020-21: (55%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (47%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Kati Pearson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

At Golden Gate Elementary School, students will achieve personal success in their learning and will become responsible and productive leaders.

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

We are leading everyday through responsible, respectful, and problem solving techniques. Our students will encourage, collaborate, and challenge one another to become successful leaders.

### 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
Caseres, Maryann	Principal	<p>Both the Principal and Assistant Principal share the responsibility of providing instructional leadership. School leaders attend weekly planning sessions and bi-monthly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with grade level teams, review weekly lesson plans, observe classroom instruction, monitor the implementation of the curriculum, and develop schedules to ensure a safe and orderly learning environment.</p> <p>School leaders meet regularly with teachers to discuss their ideas regarding instructional decisions and school operation through common planning meetings, PLCs, team meetings, MTSS, the School Advisory Council, and the Faculty Advisory Council. Additionally, school leaders meet informally with teachers and teams to get their perspective on various instructional decisions to meet the needs of all students.</p>
Alamo, Melissa	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal shares the responsibility of providing instructional leadership with the Principal. School leaders attend weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with grade level teams, review weekly lesson plans, observe classroom instruction, monitor the implementation of the curriculum, and develop schedules to ensure a safe and orderly learning environment.</p> <p>Manages school operations in the absence of the Principal. Provides leadership to teachers and team leaders concerning instructional programs. Assists the Principal in the supervision of all school programs. Is a member of the Leadership Team and strives to acquire knowledge in the area of literacy, supports and guides teams for ongoing collaboration. Seeks input from stakeholders before making decisions and works collaboratively with school staff for next level of supports through the MTSS process. Supports District initiatives.</p>
LeClere, Brianna	Instructional Coach	<p>Supports all instructional staff with English Language Arts instruction, analyzes data, and monitors student achievement, and providing support for the MTSS process. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. The Literacy Coach supports planning, co-teaching,</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		coaching and modeling and provides professional development to support the needs of teachers and students to improve student achievement
Judd, Jessica	Math Coach	Supports all instructional staff with Math instruction, analyzes data, and monitors student achievement, and providing support for differentiation. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. The math Coach supports planning, co-teaching, coaching and modeling and provides professional development to support the needs of teachers and students to improve student achievement.
Woronowski, Kristine	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Supports all instructional staff and students with science and math instruction, analyzes data, and monitors student achievement. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. The resource teacher supports co-teaching, reteaching and modeling to improve student achievement.
Laur, Jennifer	Guidance Counselor	Assists the Principal in maintaining a positive school climate and culture of character within the school. Serves as resource with expertise in student services. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making. Supports District initiatives that includes Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS), MTSS support for improvement in choices in behavior and provides small group and classroom instruction.
MacNeill, Melissa	Other	ESE Program Specialist Supports MTSS school procedures, professional learning and activities regarding student academic and behavioral achievement, and student intervention in an efficient, professional manner. Works collaboratively with our school based leadership team to monitor fidelity of MTSS implementation. Maintains a working knowledge of local, state, and federal laws and regulations related to compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as well as guidelines pertaining to eligibility, delivery of services, and individualized plan development. Additionally, facilitates gifted education eligibility and education plans for gifted students.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gamez, Cara	ELL Compliance Specialist	Supports teachers of English Language Learners with instruction, analyzes data and monitors student achievement. Works collaboratively with teams and/or individuals to gather input for decision making.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/7/2021, Mary Ann Caseres

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

21

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

35

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

494

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

4

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

3

**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	70	79	71	98	72	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
Attendance below 90 percent	9	17	10	9	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	1	13	9	28	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Course failure in Math	0	9	8	22	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	12	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	12	4	10	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	2	5	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/7/2022

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	54	57	76	78	69	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	414
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	13	10	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	8	8	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	7	2	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	9	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	10	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	3	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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

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

**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	54	57	76	78	69	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	414
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	13	10	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	8	8	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	7	2	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	9	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	10	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	3	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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

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

**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	48%			40%			45%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%			54%			54%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%			47%			40%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	67%			49%			47%	68%	63%
Math Learning Gains	85%			79%			57%	64%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	78%			68%			42%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	56%			45%			53%	59%	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	34%	61%	-27%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	58%	-12%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	48%	60%	-12%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

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	35%	68%	-33%	62%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	52%	65%	-13%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	67%	-23%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	51%	56%	-5%	53%	-2%
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	26	40	33	44	72	82	41				
ELL	42	52	42	66	86	81	51				
BLK	47	57		59	83						
HSP	48	57	39	68	85	79	59				
WHT	50			60							
FRL	48	58	37	67	86	78	55				

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	12	33		26	73		18				
ELL	32	50	50	46	83	80	42				
BLK	35	50		26	60		30				
HSP	40	54	53	52	82	71	46				
FRL	40	54	47	47	78	68	44				
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	8	34	36	19	52	52	19				
ELL	39	48	40	42	56	43	46				
BLK	36	51	33	38	57	41	52				
HSP	48	54	44	48	57	42	53				
WHT	50	50		50	50						
FRL	44	52	39	45	56	41	52				

### 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	61
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	487
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
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	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	62
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	62
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	55
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	61
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?

We were able to make progress and gains in all core content areas.

ELA Achievement increased from 40% to 48%

Math Achievement increased from 49% to 67%

Science Achievement increased from 45% to 56%

Our students with disabilities was an area across grade levels that need improvement. Although we increased in this area from the previous school year. Achievement within our SWD groups is our lowest subgroup.

Subgroup information in ELA Achievement:

SWD - 26%

ELL - 42%

BLK - 47%

HSP - 48%

WHT - 50%

Subgroup information in Math Achievement:

SWD - 44%

ELL - 66%

BLK - 59%

HSP - 68%

WHT - 60%

Subgroup information in Science Achievement:

SWD - 41%

ELL - 51%

HSP - 59%

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

Our lowest performing area is ELA achievement and Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup in all core content areas. The following areas of what contributed to our performance.

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

The factors that contributed to this decline are:

- Planning to allow for ESE resource teacher to attend planning sessions and PLCs.
- Fidelity of delivery of instruction following gradual release model that allows for direct instruction, and dialogic discourse, intervention and assessments that match success criteria of state standards.

New actions to address this need

- Differentiation to support student needs and re-teaching of benchmarks.
- High quality rigorous instruction that supports benchmarks within each standard
- Alignment of tasks to success criteria of benchmark
- Increase fluid scheduling of MTSS shifts within the Tier process.

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

The area with the most improvement was math achievement increasing from 49% to 67%.

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

Intentional focus on standards based planning and lessons aligned to success criteria.  
Focused instructional practices  
Model, co-teach and push in support during instruction by academic coaches.  
Master schedule to maximize push-in support.  
Fidelity of instruction as modeled and coached by academic coaches, intervention and assessments that matched success criteria of state standards.

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

- Continued intentional focus on what high-quality rigorous instruction aligned to benchmarks.
- Professional development to support teacher capacity in instructional strategies and monitoring.
- Fidelity of delivery of instruction within gradual release model that allows for direct instruction, and dialogic discourse, intervention and assessments that match success criteria of state standards.
- After School Programs
- Strategies to cognitively engage students moving from teacher-centered to student-centered learning.

**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.**

- Focus on building the effectiveness of Collaborative Planning.
- Professional Learning focused on authentic and cognitive engagement strategies.
- Continue focusing on building Academics, Leadership, and Culture through Leader in Me.

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

- Build intentional systems school-wide to ensure sustainability for future success.

### **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 Standards-aligned Instruction**

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

SY22 student performance in fifth grade science indicated a three-year upward trend in proficiency, particularly related to the Nature of Science and Earth and Space Science subcategories. Additionally, for the SY23 cohort, student performance in ELA was below 60% proficiency. Walkthrough data indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark.

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

When teachers deliver standards-based instruction that utilizes the 5E model and District resources, fifth grade proficiency on the Spring 2023 Grade 5 Statewide Science Assessment will increase 5 percentage points, from 55% to 60%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored by Science End of Unit assessments, quarterly benchmarks, and Progress Monitoring Adventures. Teachers will also be using exit tickets and interactive notebooks to monitor students' learning and understanding of the benchmarks.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Melissa Alamo (alamom@collierschools.com)

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

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this area of focus is the 5E model. Lessons/benchmarks follow this model and professional development will be provided to ensure that all teachers understand this model.

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

Following the state benchmarks/district curriculum guide, lessons are created and implemented using this model as it strategically breaks down the main components of the Science lesson. This instructional model allows teachers to engage, explore, explain, elaborate, and evaluate through an instructional sequence over a series of lessons. These elements of the 5E model ensure that students are hands-on while also making sure they have an understanding of background knowledge, vocabulary, and application of what they're learning.

**selecting 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.

All Science-content teachers will participate in professional development on the 5E model for high quality, standards-aligned science instruction.

**Person Responsible** Kristine Woronowski (woronokr@collierschools.com)

Teachers will engage in standards-aligned, collaborative planning that incorporates the 5E model.

**Person Responsible** Kristine Woronowski (woronokr@collierschools.com)

Teachers will implement weekly lesson plans with a focus on Marzano's Element of Using Questions to help Students Elaborate on Content.

**Person Responsible** Kristine Woronowski (woronokr@collierschools.com)

Lessons plans

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

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

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

Although Math achievement has increased over the last three years to 67% overall from 46%. We are still 1% below the district. Additionally, Math achievement is below the 80% proficiency goal. The need for differentiated instruction and support along with ongoing progress monitoring is critical and essential to improve student performance.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By consistently utilizing collaborative structures, student math proficiency meeting math standards will increase by June 2023, moving from 67% to 80% as measured by FAST/STAR Progress Monitoring 3.

**Monitoring:**

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

Students will be taking 3 Progress Monitoring Assessments (FAST/STAR) that will demonstrate their growth from the beginning of the year to the end of the year. Additional tools for monitoring include math unit assessments, progress monitoring adventures (school-based), classroom observations, deliberate planning sessions, quarterly benchmarks, and impact cycles.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Melissa Alamo (alamom@collierschools.com)

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

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

To engage students in their learning, and move towards a student-centered learning environment, purposeful collaborative structures to facilitate meaningful mathematical discourse will be integrated during math.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Purposeful collaborative structures will be based on strategic pairings/ groupings throughout the lesson. Using these structures allow students to interact, practice, and apply math strategies together using manipulatives, visuals, white boards, interactive notebooks and aid in student discourse.

**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.

All teachers will be provided professional development to build their collection of engagement strategies including when/how/why they should be used.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Judd (juddj@collierschools.com)

Teachers will engage in standards-aligned collaborative planning that will incorporate engagement strategies specifically selected to align with the benchmark/unit being taught.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Judd (juddj@collierschools.com)

Student performance data using formative assessments/unit assessments, exit tickets, progress monitoring adventures (school), and progress monitoring assessments (State) will be monitored during PLCs regularly for progress towards goals.

**Person Responsible**      Jessica Judd (juddj@collierschools.com)

Using manipulatives, ensure that students have a basis for understanding math concepts, especially in the primary grades. These manipulatives allow students to be hands-on and have concrete experiences with math concepts. This develops a foundation of conceptual understanding of mathematical concepts and aids in student discourse.

**Person Responsible**      Jessica Judd (juddj@collierschools.com)

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

Based on SY 22 data, overall, proficiency for our students with disabilities has increased over the last three years, but they continue to perform below their grade level and district peers. Data shows they are the lowest subgroup at Golden Gate Elementary.

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

ELA proficiency in SY22 was 11% for SWD, compared to 51% for non-SWD (40 point gap)  
Math proficiency in SY22 was 42% for SWD, compared to 67% for non-SWD (25 point gap)  
Science proficiency in SY22 was 29% for SWD, compared to 55% for non-SWD (26 point gap)

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

Increase proficiency in students with disabilities in each academic area by providing consistency with appropriate scaffolding aligned to grade level benchmarks, and daily push-in support. By June 2023, students with disabilities will increase by 5% or more in each tested area moving from ELA 26% to 31%, Math 44% to 49%, and Science 41% to 46%.

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

Weekly and quarterly assessments will be reviewed and discussed during bimonthly grade-level PLCs to ensure that all students are making adequate progress. Assessments and tasks reviewed will include culminating tasks, benchmark assessments, progress monitoring assessments, and core adventures assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Melissa Alamo (alamom@collierschools.com)

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

Adjustments to differentiation during core instruction aligned to grade level expectations will be discussed during weekly planning sessions and data will be monitored during bimonthly PLCs.

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

Evidence indicates a need for support staff to collaborate with classroom teachers to differentiate instruction incorporating collaborative structures to increase student achievement, as well as strategic scheduling to maximize support in classrooms.

**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.

Monthly data PLCs that include classroom teachers and case managers will be held with all grade levels to review data, monitor progress, and make decisions to identify supports.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Alamo (alamom@collierschools.com)

Professional development to support classroom teachers with strategies to scaffold instruction providing differentiation aligned to grade level instruction.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Alamo (alamom@collierschools.com)

Lesson plans will be monitored for differentiation and accommodations that support grade level expectations.

**Person Responsible**                      Melissa Alamo (alamom@collierschools.com)

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### **Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

ELA proficiency is an area that continues to be a critical area of need at Golden Gate Elementary and was the lowest area for our students. Based on i-Ready Diagnostic 1 for SY23, 14% of students in grades K-2 either tested at Mid or on grade level.

### **Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

ELA proficiency is an area that continues to be a critical area of need at Golden Gate Elementary and was the lowest area for our students. Data based on 2022 FSA, showed an overall proficiency rate of 48% for our students. Based on i-Ready Diagnostic 1 for SY23, 28% of students in grades 3-5 either tested at Mid or on grade level.

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Golden Gate Elementary will increase ELA proficiency of at least 70% as measured by FAST and i-Ready by implementing a school-wide intentional focus on benchmark aligned instruction and using questions to help students elaborate on content.

The implementation of benchmark aligned instruction and questioning will be observed and specific feedback will be provided.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Golden Gate Elementary will increase ELA proficiency of at least 75% as measured by FAST and i-Ready by implementing a school-wide intentional focus on benchmark aligned instruction and using questions to help students elaborate on content.

The implementation of benchmark aligned instruction and questioning will be observed and specific feedback will be provided.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Students will take progress monitoring from STAR/FAST and quarterly benchmarks. Additional tools for monitoring include module culminating tasks, instruction and planning, i-Ready diagnostic assessments, instructional impact cycles, collaborative planning sessions, MTSS meetings, student data chats, and teacher data chats.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Caseres, Maryann, caserema@collierschools.com

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Golden Gate Elementary will focus on implementing a comprehensive approach to teaching English Language Arts (ELA) through careful monitoring, data tracking, and extended school learning opportunities for students. In addition, the evidence-based practice in using questions to help students elaborate on content along with job-embedded professional development for staff during ELA planning will build teacher capacity with an intentional focus on benchmark-aligned instruction. Professional development during planning will include foundational skills, and ELA techniques/strategies including inferencing, summarizing, elaboration, comprehension, and integration of graphic organizers and writing to support student learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Having a school-wide intentional focus on benchmark-aligned instruction as well as monitoring, data tracking, and job-embedded professional development will allow sound instructional adjustments to be made to support student progression, support, and build teacher capacity.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning



Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Administration will attend weekly collaborative planning with the literacy coach and schedule non-evaluative instructional rounds to support teacher capacity. Some teachers can also be supported through a coaching impact cycle.	Caseres, Maryann, caserema@collierschools.com
The implementation of benchmark aligned instruction and questioning will be observed and specific feedback will be provided.	Caseres, Maryann, caserema@collierschools.com
Job-embedded professional development using the Marzano's Teacher Evaluation model will be provided to all teachers in order to build teacher capacity within Using questions to elaborate on content.	LeClere, Brianna, leclub@collierschools.com
This may include co-teaching, whisper coaching, and modeled lessons to support effective ELA delivery of instruction. Differentiated PD will be provided as needed	LeClere, Brianna, leclub@collierschools.com
Student performance data using formative assessments, module culminating tasks, state progress monitoring assessments, data PLCs, iReady Diagnostics will be monitored regularly to ensure there is progress towards school-wide goals.	Alamo, Melissa, alamom@collierschools.com
Leadership Team including administration and instructional coaches will meet weekly to review student performance data and classroom observations in order to monitor the progress towards the goal.	Caseres, Maryann, caserema@collierschools.com
Job-embedded Vertical articulation benchmark progression during collaborative planning sessions will occur weekly to help teachers better understand students depth of knowledge and build teacher capacity.	LeClere, Brianna, leclub@collierschools.com
During Professional Learning Days teacher will have the opportunity to choose focused trainings based on perceived areas of needed growth to support student progression.	Alamo, Melissa, alamom@collierschools.com

### Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

**Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

Golden Gate Elementary will continue to build a positive school culture and environment with all stakeholders through various family events incorporating the 7 Habits and support our academic goals. Various family events including student led, family challenges STEAM events, literacy nights, report card pick-up nights, student led conferences, and parent classes to support student academic needs with English classes. Various topics to help families at home will be offered with the help of our parent involvement assistant coordinating all events. To continue school traditions and include stakeholder voices surveys will be utilized and sent to parents, students, and staff. Our Family Engagement/Action Team will organize all family/school events.

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

At Golden Gate Elementary our Leader in Me Lighthouse Action Teams in conjunction with our student Mini-Lighthouse identify and coordinate all school and family events. All our student clubs promote a Pay it Forward to give back to our community. Our School Advisory Council (SAC) comprised of parents, school and community members assist in evaluating school data and school improvement plan.