

Pasco County Schools

Gulf High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Gulf High School

5355 SCHOOL RD, New Port Richey, FL 34652

<https://ghs.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Jeff Morgenstein

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (47%) 2014-15: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

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 Pasco 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Gulf High School

5355 SCHOOL RD, New Port Richey, FL 34652

<https://ghs.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	73%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://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.

Providing a world-class education for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All our students achieve success in college, career, and life.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Morgenstein, Jeff	Principal	
Howard, Francesca	Assistant Principal	
Macri-Grim, Cheryl	Assistant Principal	
Strasser, Robert	Assistant Principal	
Luter, Laura	Assistant Principal	
Martin, Hilda	Assistant Principal	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393	430	389	369	1581
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	81	81	72	333
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	103	56	51	255
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	193	148	158	549
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	167	121	83	488

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	181	133	119	517

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/30/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	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	42%	57%	56%	48%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	53%	51%	50%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	41%	42%	38%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	42%	56%	51%	46%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	33%	49%	48%	48%	45%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	23%	42%	45%	29%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	46%	70%	68%	66%	65%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	62%	73%	73%	53%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	393 (0)	430 (0)	389 (0)	369 (0)	1581 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	99 ()	81 ()	81 ()	72 ()	333 (0)
One or more suspensions	45 ()	103 ()	56 ()	51 ()	255 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	50 ()	193 ()	148 ()	158 ()	549 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	117 ()	167 ()	121 ()	83 ()	488 (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
09	2019	39%	57%	-18%	55%	-16%
	2018	41%	55%	-14%	53%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	41%	53%	-12%	53%	-12%
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	45%	68%	-23%	67%	-22%
2018	48%	65%	-17%	65%	-17%
Compare		-3%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	69%	-10%	70%	-11%
2018	54%	70%	-16%	68%	-14%
Compare		5%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	60%	-30%	61%	-31%
2018	31%	63%	-32%	62%	-31%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	62%	-13%	57%	-8%
2018	50%	60%	-10%	56%	-6%
Compare		-1%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	38	36	26	19	18	23	42		82	16
ELL	10	25	17	26	34	27	11			92	45
ASN	74	52		63	57		77			100	88
BLK	39	33		23	36		17	38		73	

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
HSP	35	37	24	35	24	13	38	55		93	29
MUL	40	39	20	44	32		35	50		89	59
WHT	43	41	32	46	36	28	52	69		82	41
FRL	36	38	29	39	31	24	43	59		82	33
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	13	24	18	15	39	35	15	44		62	15
ELL	7	36		13	20		38			80	
ASN	88	70		86	67		93			100	75
BLK	10	41	57	25	42		28	43		69	27
HSP	38	34	29	38	44	35	42	55		87	49
MUL	53	63		44	44		56	53		100	39
WHT	49	51	30	46	51	47	52	60		78	48
FRL	39	45	33	39	47	46	44	53		79	41
2017 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	8	39	42	18	35	37	32	31		66	11
ELL	10	18		31	45						
ASN	73	63		73	71		80			100	85
BLK	32	48	42	17	19		29			60	
HSP	41	52	32	40	44	36	64	25		86	39
MUL	46	43	40	45	52	25	57	50		75	67
WHT	49	49	41	48	49	26	68	61		77	42
FRL	42	46	38	40	42	28	60	46		73	35

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	88%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	73
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	45
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	47
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Both ELA and math learning gains of the lowest 25% were the lowest, 28% and 23% respectively. A possible contributing factor for this is the need for more intense monitoring the progress of students in those groups.

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

Math learning gains of the lowest 25% showed the greatest decline from the prior year. A possible contributing factor for this is the need for more intense monitoring the progress of students in those groups.

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.

Math learning gains of the lowest quartile and science showed the greatest gaps when compared to the state--22 points. A possible contributing factor for this is the need for more intense monitoring the progress of students in those groups.

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

Social studies performance increased 5 points. A possible contributing factor is the use of AVID strategies.

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

SIT/SLT will to collaborate to identify off-track students and create plans/strategies to increase the graduation rate and the ESE graduation rate.

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

1. Performance of the lowest quartile of students in ELA and math
2. Subgroup performance of SWD, ELL, Black, and Hispanic students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	High Impact Instruction
Rationale	Students need to be exposed to grade level instruction on a daily basis and assessments need to match the rigor of the standards.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Increase ELA learning gains, ELA learning gains of the lowest 25%, math learning gains, and math learning gains of the lowest quartile to at least 41%</p> <p>Improve subgroup performance of SWD, ELL, Black, and Hispanic students to at least 41%</p> <p>Improve math and ELA achievement by 5 percentage points</p> <p>Improve science and social studies performance by 5 percentage points</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jeff Morgenstein (jmorgens@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>1.Create and update resource folders on Sharepoint with AVID strategies and best practices for teachers to access.</p> <p>2.Hold regular PLC meetings to include dedicated time for discussion of increasing rigor of instruction and the implementation of appropriate AVID strategies aligned with learning outcome goals</p> <p>3.School-wide AVID strategies training and reinforcement of previous learning. Focus on leveling up and providing extension learning for students who have mastered standards.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Ensuring that students are being taught and assessed using grade level essential standards will increase performance.
Action Step	
Description	<p>Design and delivery of lessons to increase student experiences with AVID strategies and other best practices for teaching and learning.</p> <p>Analysis of student performance data for continuous monitoring of rigorous instructional practices.</p> <p>Identify strategies to increase student demonstrations of mastery of course standards.</p> <p>Develop strategies and resources to address Tier 2 student needs.</p> <p>Provide discipline-specific training in the development of higher-level thinking strategies and questioning techniques.</p> <p>Choice for PLCs in scheduling meeting times.</p> <p>Conduct PLC member learning walks.</p> <p>Conduct School Leadership Team cross-curricular learning walks.</p> <p>Use of discipline-specific data to monitor student achievement.</p> <p>Use of interactive notebooks as an AVID strategy.</p> <p>Incorporating further aspects of gradual release, especially among newer teachers.</p> <p>Specific planning for addressing IEP goals and levels.</p>
Person Responsible	Jeff Morgenstein (jmorgens@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Data Driven Decisions
Rationale	Use data to identify students needing supports to achieve grade level standards mastery will allow interventions to be put in place
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Increase ELA learning gains, ELA learning gains of the lowest 25%, math learning gains, and math learning gains of the lowest quartile to at least 41%</p> <p>Improve subgroup performance of SWD, ELL, Black, and Hispanic students to at least 41%</p> <p>Improve math and ELA achievement by 5 percentage points</p> <p>Improve science and social studies performance by 5 percentage points</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jeff Morgenstein (jmorgens@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers collect and analyze multiple forms of relevant data to guide instructional decisions and effectively develop, monitor, and increase systems to support students' learning in the planning cycle.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Examining multiple forms of data will assist teachers in determining which practices are working effectively with learners.
Action Step	
Description	<p>Focus on anchor standards across the curriculum.</p> <p>Utilizing CFAs and quarterly checks to drive instruction.</p> <p>Start early in year for EOC preparations.</p> <p>Design PLC plan for cycled meeting times.</p> <p>Deliver mini workshops on strategies to develop uniform procedures and expectations for new and less experienced teachers as well as consistency among all faculty.</p> <p>Ensure that behavior plans for students with significant needs are in place and up-to-date.</p> <p>Reinforce School wide rules and expectations with verbal and visual cues.</p> <p>Set hierarchy of consequences shared with staff.</p> <p>Use LCE curriculum throughout the school year (InD).</p> <p>Identify students that would benefit from taking the TABE (Test of Adult Basic Education).</p> <p>Utilize Tier 2 resources (adopted resources/district created) to implement RTI.</p>
Person Responsible	Jeff Morgenstein (jmorgens@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Collaborative Culture
Rationale	Teachers and staff will collaborate with all stakeholders to increase student hope and student/staff engagement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA learning gains, ELA learning gains of the lowest 25%, math learning gains, and math learning gains of the lowest quartile to at least 41% Improve subgroup performance of SWD, ELL, Black, and Hispanic students to at least 41% Improve math and ELA achievement by 5 percentage points Improve science and social studies performance by 5 percentage points
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jeff Morgenstein (jmorgens@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Promote student engagement and participation in school activities, Focus on department morale and engagement, increase PBIS understanding and use of interventions, and increase student exposure to college and career resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Through increasing collective responsibility as well as staff and student engagement, we will see an increase in student achievement.
Action Step	
Description	Provide positive culture-building activities. Increase student choice in assignments and more control over their day. Meet with teachers to gain insight into what needs to be addressed to improve school climate: Parking, Clocks, and Vending machine access, e.g. Provide incentives to teachers cover other teacher's classes. Increase Inclusion opportunities on campus for all students. Behavioral supports to increase knowledge of expectations PBIS. Inservice for best practices for inclusion. Conduct SEL training on each early release day.
Person Responsible	Jeff Morgenstein (jmorgens@pasco.k12.fl.us)

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).

NA