# Gainesville High School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Gainesville High School

## 1900 NW 13TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32609

### https://www.sbac.edu/gainesville

## Demographics

## Principal: Daniel Ferguson

Start Date for this Principal: 12/3/2010

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status** <br> (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** <br> (per MSID File) | High School <br> 9-12 |
| **Primary Service Type** <br> (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** <br> (as reported on Survey 3) | 47% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented** <br> (subgroups with 10 or more students) <br> (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* <br> English Language Learners <br> Asian Students <br> Black/African American Students <br> Hispanic Students <br> Multiracial Students <br> White Students <br> Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (60%) <br><br> 2017-18: B (59%) <br><br> 2016-17: B (57%) <br><br> 2015-16: B (56%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Cassandra Brusca |
| **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 was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

## 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.

# Table of Contents

## Gainesville High School

### 1900 NW 13TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32609

### https://www.sbac.edu/gainesville

### School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2019-20 Title I School** | **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| High School<br>9-12 | No | 61% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 62% |

### School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | B | B | B | B |

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

### 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.**

The mission of Gainesville High School is to provide students with an appreciation of their intrinsic value and to develop within them the skills, knowledge, and curiosity which will enable them to lead fulfilling and productive lives in a rapidly changing and increasingly complex society.
Beliefs:
1. Our school's priority is student learning.
2. Our students have the capacity to learn the skills and concepts necessary to become productive citizens which will enable them to become confident, self-directed, life long learners.
3. Student learning improves in a safe, comfortable environment.
4. A partnership between families, the school and community benefits all students.
5. Diversity increases students' understanding of other people and cultures.

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

Gainesville High School is committed to challenging all students to achieve their highest potential.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Shelnutt, David | Principal | Instructional Leader |
| Becker, Mallory | Assistant Principal | ESE, ESOL, Guidance |
| Hartwell, Libby | Assistant Principal | Facilities, Deans, Instructional Materials |
| Green, John | Assistant Principal | Student Services |
| Hogan, April | Instructional Media | Media Specialist |
| Butfiloski, Carmen | School Counselor | Cambridge Coordinator |
| Fields, David | Teacher, K-12 | US History Teacher |
| Forgione, Joshua | Teacher, K-12 | SS Department Chair |
| Long, Detra | Teacher, K-12 | Math Department Chair |
| Paxson, Maggie | Teacher, K-12 | Science Department Chair |
| Plavac, Janinie | Teacher, Career/Technical | Career and Technical Department Chair |
| Solito, Kathleen | Teacher, K-12 | English Department Chair |
| Montgomery, Tara | Teacher, ESE | ESE Department Chair |
| | | |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Friday 12/3/2010, Daniel Ferguson

**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.*
1

**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.*
12

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
90

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | High School<br>9-12 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 47% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (60%)<br><br>2017-18: B (59%)<br><br>2016-17: B (57%)<br><br>2015-16: B (56%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Cassandra Brusca |
| **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. | |

## 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 | 410 | 581 | 463 | 371 | 1825 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 63 | 47 | 35 | 201 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 38 | 21 | 9 | 98 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 67 | 44 | 24 | 159 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 75 | 56 | 33 | 193 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 122 | 97 | 51 | 389 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 126 | 115 | 62 | 407 |

**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 | 118 | 140 | 107 | 62 | 427 |

**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 | 20 | 41 | 30 | 3 | 94 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 24 | 9 | 4 | 47 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 6/3/2020

## 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 509 | 525 | 464 | 450 | 1948 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 41 | 34 | 31 | 148 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 54 | 29 | 14 | 147 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 82 | 67 | 42 | 237 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 197 | 42 | 75 | 476 |

**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 | 65 | 104 | 65 | 32 | 266 |

**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 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 29 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 509 | 525 | 464 | 450 | 1948 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 41 | 34 | 31 | 148 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 54 | 29 | 14 | 147 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 82 | 67 | 42 | 237 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 197 | 42 | 75 | 476 |

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 | 65 | 104 | 65 | 32 | 266 |

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 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 29 |
| 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 | 58% | 59% | 56% | 58% | 57% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 53% | 52% | 51% | 56% | 54% | 49% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 38% | 39% | 42% | 40% | 42% | 41% |
| Math Achievement | 55% | 54% | 51% | 51% | 47% | 49% |
| Math Learning Gains | 56% | 54% | 48% | 49% | 41% | 44% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 40% | 48% | 45% | 36% | 32% | 39% |
| Science Achievement | 64% | 68% | 68% | 66% | 65% | 65% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 75% | 75% | 73% | 71% | 74% | 70% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Indicator** | **Grade Level (prior year reported)** | | | | **Total** |
| | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | |
| | (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** |
| 09 | 2019 | 56% | 60% | -4% | 55% | 1% |
| | 2018 | 55% | 58% | -3% | 53% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 55% | 55% | 0% | 53% | 2% |
| | 2018 | 58% | 60% | -2% | 53% | 5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| 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 | 61% | 66% | -5% | 67% | -6% |
| 2018 | 67% | 68% | -1% | 65% | 2% |
| Compare | | -6% | | | |

| 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 | 74% | 71% | 3% | 70% | 4% |
| 2018 | 71% | 71% | 0% | 68% | 3% |
| Compare | | 3% | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 22% | 56% | -34% | 61% | -39% |
| 2018 | 25% | 60% | -35% | 62% | -37% |
| Compare | | -3% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 46% | 48% | -2% | 57% | -11% |
| 2018 | 55% | 63% | -8% | 56% | -1% |
| Compare | | -9% | | | |

## 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 | 12 | 35 | 36 | 19 | 17 | | 19 | 30 | | 83 | 40 |
| ELL | 11 | 39 | 40 | 43 | 59 | 50 | 26 | 58 | | 76 | 43 |
| ASN | 78 | 58 | 40 | 79 | 81 | | 80 | 95 | | 100 | 70 |
| BLK | 29 | 38 | 34 | 27 | 33 | 35 | 34 | 55 | | 95 | 38 |
| HSP | 43 | 48 | 43 | 50 | 55 | 36 | 45 | 63 | | 78 | 72 |
| MUL | 56 | 52 | 36 | 49 | 56 | | 72 | 71 | | 100 | 67 |
| WHT | 82 | 65 | 42 | 80 | 65 | 53 | 85 | 92 | | 97 | 83 |
| FRL | 32 | 38 | 37 | 32 | 38 | 32 | 40 | 62 | | 93 | 46 |
| 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 | 17 | 28 | 22 | 10 | 21 | 14 | 27 | 38 | | 66 | 29 |
| ELL | 16 | 53 | 50 | 38 | 51 | 52 | 45 | 25 | | 78 | 43 |
| ASN | 82 | 85 | | 84 | 73 | | 92 | 80 | | 95 | 72 |
| BLK | 31 | 43 | 40 | 24 | 34 | 37 | 42 | 53 | | 80 | 30 |
| HSP | 39 | 44 | 35 | 36 | 40 | 40 | 58 | 65 | | 92 | 51 |
| MUL | 57 | 65 | 45 | 55 | 52 | | 77 | 84 | | 95 | 61 |
| WHT | 84 | 71 | 33 | 67 | 59 | 41 | 90 | 92 | | 95 | 75 |
| FRL | 40 | 49 | 40 | 34 | 38 | 42 | 54 | 63 | | 83 | 37 |

| | **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 | 14 | 40 | 37 | 13 | 33 | 32 | 28 | 40 | | 59 | 32 |
| ELL | 8 | 50 | 52 | 29 | 48 | 50 | 29 | 47 | | 85 | 45 |
| ASN | 82 | 63 | | 82 | 71 | | 89 | 76 | | 80 | 67 |
| BLK | 31 | 39 | 31 | 22 | 30 | 31 | 39 | 51 | | 81 | 23 |
| HSP | 40 | 58 | 54 | 46 | 49 | 36 | 55 | 70 | | 87 | 70 |
| MUL | 60 | 58 | 43 | 48 | 38 | 46 | 59 | 72 | | 89 | 60 |
| WHT | 81 | 68 | 58 | 75 | 64 | 38 | 86 | 90 | | 91 | 77 |
| FRL | 34 | 42 | 38 | 30 | 33 | 34 | 40 | 58 | | 80 | 33 |

## 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 | 60 |
| 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 | 57 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 655 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 95% |

| 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% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 46 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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 |

| Asian Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 72 |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 62 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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 | 46 |
| 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 shows the lowest performance is the bottom quartile ELA learning gains. Our school dropped from 40% to 38%. We attribute some of this to our large number of ESOL students, we are currently in the process of reorganizing this program with new instructors and more emphasis on increasing reading skills.

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

Our overall ELA learning gains decreased from 59% to 53%. Again, this is the same trend we see with the lowest quartile ELA learning gains. We are addressing this through our ESOL instruction as well as our Reading instruction. We have new instructors in both of these areas.

**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.**

Largest gap area is Lowest Quartile Math gains. State is at 45%, GHS is at 40%. This continues to be an area of focus, especially in Algebra 1.

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

Math achievement in general showed the most improvement, going from 46% to 55%. Implementing informal geometry has helped contribute to the success our students are showing on the Geometry EOC.

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

Areas of concern: Current 11th grade students have the highest suspension rates and the highest number of failed courses.

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

1. Student Safety
2. Closing the Achievement gap
3. Reducing the number of suspensions (all students and AA students.)
4. Graduation Rate
5. ESSA - Increase the achievement rate of SWD subgroup

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Decrease the number of out of School suspension for all and for AA students. Fewer suspensions result in more time spent in class engaged in instructional activities. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | GHS will reduce the number of out of school suspensions of AA students by at least 15% as compared to the 2019-20 data.<br><br>For the first three nine weeks of the year, GHS showed a 1% decrease in the number of AA students suspended, and the number of suspension days decreased by 6% from the 18-19 school year to the 19-20 school year. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Libby Hartwell (hartwelles@gm.sbac.edu) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Restorative practices will be employed for each referral. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Restorative practices aim to find ways to keep students in school while providing them with opportunities to receive counseling or education related to the offense. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. One restorative practice action is given for each offence
2. Use of the BASE SEL program to pinpoint the SEL topic to the offence.
3. Use of Student of the Week positive behavior program school wide.
4. Lower the number of days out of school when a student does receive a suspension.

| **Person Responsible** | Libby Hartwell (hartwelles@gm.sbac.edu) |
|---|---|

| #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Students with Disabilities subgroup at 32% achievement |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | GHS will raise the percent of achievement based on the FSA to 41% for students with disabilities. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | John Green (greenje@gm.sbac.edu) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Support Facilitation. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Students with Disabilities who are struggling will be placed in a support facilitation cohort. One ESE teacher travels with each grade level co-hort to each of the academic courses for the group. The co-hort also has a learning strategies class with the same ESE teacher. |

| Action Steps to Implement | |
|---|---|

1. Cohort Support Facilitation classes
2. Learning Strategies classes
3. Free after school tutoring.

| **Person Responsible** | John Green (greenje@gm.sbac.edu) |
|---|---|

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Our ELL graduation rate decreased from 78% in 17-18 to 76% in 18-19. The rate is _____ for the 19-20 school year. As the ESOL Center high school, GHS is working on ways to significantly increase |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | GHS will increase graduation rate by 5% over the 19-20 rate. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | John Green (greenje@gm.sbac.edu) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Frequent meeting and planning with counselors and ESOL home liason |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Counselors meet frequently with students who may be credit deficient to keep them motivated and to find ways to get them back on track or the keep them on track. |

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Meeting with counselors/parents
2. CROP offered during school and after school
3. JFG Jobs for Florida Graduatess
4. Additional ESOL paras have been hired
5. Specialist to tutor ACT and SAT strategies
6. Work with ESOL Home Liason to keep parents informed of progress

| **Person Responsible** | John Green (greenje@gm.sbac.edu) |
|---|---|

| #4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Increase the achievement of AA students<br><br>AA students' achievement level for ELA decreased from 31% in 2018 to 29% in 2019<br>AA students' achievement level for Math increased slightly from 24 in 2018 to 27% in 2019 |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | A. Raise the achievement of AA students in ELA by 3 percentage points.<br>Raise the achievement of AA students in Math by 3 percentage points.<br><br>B. GHS will increase participation of AA students in advanced and accelerated courses and programs by 2<br>percentage points annually. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Mallory Becker (beckermk@gm.sbac.edu) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | A. Learning Strategies classes for most level 1 and 2 students in this subgroup<br><br>B. Teachers and counselors will encourage AA students to register for more rigorous courses. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Most of our lower achieving AA students are also identified as ESE students. These students are placed in a cohort that travels with an ESE teacher to all academic classes as well as spending one period a day in a learning strategies class to work on homework, test taking strategies and reading comprehension skills. |

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Liberal Arts Math prior to taking Algebra 1
2. Free tutoring by certified teachers offered three afternoons a week.
3. ELA boot camps offered prior to FSA testing.
4. Intensive reading classes for level one students
5. Support facilitation for the ESE students
6. Learning Strategies classes.

| **Person Responsible** | Mallory Becker (beckermk@gm.sbac.edu) |
|---|---|

| #5. Other specifically relating to Increase the gains of the lowest quartile | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | During the 18-19 school year, the learning gains of our lowest quartile in ELA is 38%, in Math 40% |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | ELA lowest quartile: Increase by 3 percentage points annually, or 1 percentage point over the highest of the last 3 years, whichever is greater. Math lowest quartile: Increase by 3 percentage points annually, or 1 percentage point over the highest of the last 3 years, whichever is greater. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Mallory Becker (beckermk@gm.sbac.edu) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Struggling math students are given an extra year of math instruction prior to taking the Alg. 1 EOC as well as other supports in both Math and ELA |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Struggling math students are given an extra year of math instruction prior to taking the Alg. 1 EOC as well as other supports in both Math and ELA. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Liberal Arts Math prior to taking Algebra 1
2. Free tutoring by certified teachers offered three afternoons a week.
3. ELA boot camps offered prior to FSA testing.
4. Intensive reading classes for level one students.

**Person Responsible**    [no one identified]

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**School Safety**
**The following have been put into place in order to increase the level of safety of our school.**
**1. Camera surveillance of campus perimeter - monitored at 11 work stations.**
**2. Additional gates provided by district to more fully enclose the campus**
**3. Single point of entry - public doors at the south end of the administrative complex have been locked and traffic redirected to the main office.**
**4. Classroom doors locked at all times.**
**5. Monthly ALICE drills**
**6. YMHFA training for all administrators, deans and counselors. Cognito training for all staff.**
**7. Collaboration with Law Enforcement/ Gainesville Fire and Rescue for responding to an emergency.**

## 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.

Gainesville High School strives to create an atmosphere that is accepting and respectful of all who are on our campus. As the Center School for the district's ESOL students, we have the unique opportunity to introduce and celebrate many different cultures on our campus. Our school also has a very active GSA (organization for LGBTQ students) as well as supportive faculty and staff. Our HOPE Squad has grown considerably and makes a point to reach out to any student who may be alone or who may need a friend to talk with.

We communicate in several different ways in order to reach as many stakeholders as possible. Through the use of emails (to parents and students,) Instagram and Twitter, we are able to reach a wide variety of our stakeholders and these platforms allow for two way communication.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.