

Pinellas County Schools

Gibbs High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	34
Budget to Support Goals	34

Gibbs High School

850 34TH ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33711

<http://www.gibbs-hs.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Barry Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas 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	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	34

Gibbs High School

850 34TH ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33711

<http://www.gibbs-hs.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas 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.

To create a collaborative environment where our scholars will display Respect, Excellence, and Pride.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive to prepare 100% of our scholars to achieve post-secondary readiness and become contributing members of society.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brown, Barry	Principal	As the principal, I partner with faculty and staff members to set measurable goals to support teaching and learning. While also overseeing the day to operations to ensure all members of our school community feel safe, appreciated, and supported.
Diaz, Michele	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Diaz is the assistant principal for curriculum and she supervises the English, Reading, and the world language department.
Johnson, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Johnson is the assistant principal for the Business Economics and Technology Academy (BETA) Magnet Program and she supervises the Math Department.
Machado, Michael	Assistant Principal	Mr. Machado is the assistant principal in charge of athletics and he supervises the science department.
Patrick, Dejuan	Assistant Principal	Mr. Patrick is the assistant principal in charge of school climate and culture; he also supervises the social studies department.
Weston, Derek	Assistant Principal	Mr. Weston is the assistant principal for the Pinellas Count Center for the Arts Program (PCCA).

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/12/2021, Barry Brown

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.*

2

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

76

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,154

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

16

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

13

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	292	343	261	250	1146
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	144	110	123	454
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	24	15	12	90
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194	92	91	11	388
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228	96	80	6	410
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	100	106	89	434
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	100	106	89	434
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	100	106	89	434

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	203	117	103	86	509

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	5	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/8/2021

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	0

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

2020-21 - 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	361	270	243	201	1075
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156	112	108	106	482
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	18	9	6	57
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194	92	91	11	388
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228	96	80	6	410
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	100	106	89	434
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	100	106	89	434

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	203	117	103	86	509

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	5	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				42%	56%	56%	43%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				42%	51%	51%	44%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				28%	43%	42%	34%	44%	44%
Math Achievement				31%	45%	51%	30%	46%	51%
Math Learning Gains				42%	44%	48%	39%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	41%	45%	46%	42%	45%
Science Achievement				41%	64%	68%	50%	66%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				53%	71%	73%	59%	72%	71%

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
09	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	55%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	41%	53%	-12%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

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	
2021						
2019	43%	62%	-19%	67%	-24%	

CIVICS EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019						

HISTORY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019	60%	70%	-10%	70%	-10%	

ALGEBRA EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019	21%	55%	-34%	61%	-40%	

GEOMETRY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	40%	56%	-16%	57%	-17%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Source: Performance Matters Scoreboard

Date pulled: 6/17/21

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45 / 24%	40 / 20%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	19 / 15%	12 / 9%	
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 17%	3 / 11%	
	English Language Learners	1 / 14%	0 / 0%	
Mathematics	All Students	40 / 23%	75 / 33%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	16 / 17%	34 / 29%	
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	
	English Language Learners	1 / 25%	1 / 25%	
Biology	All Students	53 / 31%	75 / 44%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	17 / 19%	27 / 29%	
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 33%	3 / 38%	
	English Language Learners	1 / 33%	0 / 0%	
US History	All Students	NA	NA	
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45 / 29%	30 / 20%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	16 / 17%	9 / 9%	
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 7%	
	English Language Learners	NA	0 / 0%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17 / 7%	36 / 14%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 4%	23 / 12%	
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 3%	2 / 7%	
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	6 / 8%	7 / 7%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	2 / 3%	2 / 3%	
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	5 / 50%	6 / 50%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	3 / 43%	4 / 44%	
	Students With Disabilities	NA	0 / 0%	
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53 / 40%	59 / 45%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	22 / 28%	27 / 33%	
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 11%	0 / 0%	
	English Language Learners	1 / 50%	0 / 0%	

Grade 12					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		NA	NA	
	Economically Disadvantaged		NA	NA	
	Students With Disabilities		NA	NA	
	English Language Learners		NA	NA	
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		NA	NA	
	Economically Disadvantaged		NA	NA	
	Students With Disabilities		NA	NA	
	English Language Learners		NA	NA	
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students		NA	NA	
	Economically Disadvantaged		NA	NA	
	Students With Disabilities		NA	NA	
	English Language Learners		NA	NA	
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students		2 / 50%	2 / 67%	
	Economically Disadvantaged		NA	NA	
	Students With Disabilities		0 / 0%	NA	
	English Language Learners		NA	NA	
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

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	23	31	22	21	30	47	28	38		89	31
ELL	17	8		30	10						
ASN	80	50									
BLK	19	35	32	10	22	36	25	35		89	48
HSP	45	38		29	38		48	74		95	70

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
MUL	63	64		36			55				
WHT	76	51		55	33		81	89		92	81
FRL	26	35	29	15	26	36	31	39		88	47
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	32	38	27	21	34	39	22	17		89	22
BLK	19	32	27	14	34	38	20	34		89	42
HSP	62	54		41	44		58	93		96	72
MUL	58	56		50						82	
WHT	79	55		70	57		79	92		96	82
FRL	30	36	27	22	40	39	29	38		87	45
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	26	44	38	20	37	47	42	45		81	35
BLK	19	34	33	13	31	49	25	44		79	48
HSP	64	49		48	44		59	69		91	71
MUL	58	50		60	50		82			86	42
WHT	84	63		68	54	35	88	92		93	79
FRL	29	40	33	20	36	48	38	53		75	44

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	489
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	90%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36

Students With Disabilities	
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	23
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	65
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	35
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	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
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 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	70
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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?

Black Scholars, SWD, and economically disadvantaged scholars are performing below proficiency (41%) in all core content areas..

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Black Scholars, SWD, and economically disadvantaged scholars performance below proficiency all core content areas..

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

Inconsistent Instructional staff, lack of cohesion/collaboration within the department and high transient rate of teachers and coaches; scholars entering 9th grade are below proficiency at a rate higher than the district average. Consistent Instructional staff members within core departments, proper utilizations of assigned coaches and common planning to provide the appropriate differentiated support for core content instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math Achievement for white scholars, ELA learning gains for Hispanic and Multi-Race Scholars.

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

The infusion of all scholars into English Honors Courses.

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

Heightened level of collaboration within core content departments during common planning to align their instruction and assessment to ensure data drives their instructional next steps and academic support for scholars.

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.

Core Content instructors will be engaging in Pre-AP professional development to support their implementation of the Pre-AP instructional framework and utilization of Pre-AP Resources.

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

Core content instructors will be supported throughout the year by participating in Pre-AP PLC, meeting with content coaches/specialists, sharing best practices in common planning meetings, and reflecting on feedback from administrative walk-throughs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Our current proficiency is 38% as evidenced by the Spring 2021 FSA ELA data. We expected our proficiency levels to 43% by May 22 on the FSA ELA. The problem/gap is occurring because our scholars need updates on their progress and strategy implementation to increase their learning gains based on data chats. Another gap is the faculty's fidelity of implementation of the professional development to support student growth.

Measurable Outcome:

The percentage of all students reaching proficiency on the FSA ELA will increase from 38% to 43% as measured by the FSA ELA data for May 2022.

Monitoring:

Monitoring will occur through administrative walkthroughs, formative assessments, progress monitoring, PLC and collaborative planning documents, and FSA ELA data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michele Diaz (diazm@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Leadership will support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners that differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each student. Leadership will support staff's ability to engage students with complex texts and rigorous activities through the Pre-AP curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Learning gains and proficiency data reflect a need to implement the above-mentioned strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

- ELA and reading teachers PLC together monthly around data to determine school-wide trends, areas in need of improvement, and next steps.

Person Responsible

Michele Diaz (diazm@pcsb.org)

- Literacy coaches and staff developers support teachers with differentiation, student-based learning, and monitoring toward mastery of Florida Standards.

Person Responsible

Michele Diaz (diazm@pcsb.org)

- ELA and reading teachers provide formative assessments aligned to Florida Standards in grades 6-12 (Write Score, APM Assessment).

Person Responsible

Michele Diaz (diazm@pcsb.org)

- ELA teachers utilize data collected in the form of student artifacts from Core Connections exemplar lessons to determine student needs and adjust instruction.

Person Responsible

Michele Diaz (diazm@pcsb.org)

Teachers will meet in Pre-AP PLCs at least once a month to support the implementation of the Pre-AP curriculum along with the B.E.S.T. standards to review and design lessons, activities (protocols/ collaboration discussions), and resources in order to help students practice effective elaboration techniques.

Person Responsible Michele Diaz (diazm@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our current level of proficiency is 22%, as evidenced in the FSA EOC Math data. We expect our performance level to be 32% by May 2022 on the FSA EOC Math assessment. The problem/gap is occurring because teachers must improve their ability to monitor scholar learning and make real time instructional adjustments.

Measurable Outcome: The percentage of scholars achieving proficiency will increase from 22% to 32% as measured on the FSA Math EOCs of Algebra 1 and Geometry.

Monitoring: Monitoring will occur via teacher assessments, cycle assessments and a variety of other formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Support staff to utilize data to organize scholars to interact with content in manners which differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of scholar.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Learning gains and proficiency reflect the need to implement the above-mentioned strategy

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers engage in course-specific PLCs to review assessment data, develop progress monitoring formative assessments, identify trends and next steps.

Person Responsible Nicole Johnson (johnsonni@pcsb.org)

Teachers who teach the same course utilize the same grading scales.

Person Responsible Nicole Johnson (johnsonni@pcsb.org)

Teachers regularly incorporate checks for understanding through formative assessments and use the collected data to gauge scholar progress toward mastery of the course content.

Person Responsible Nicole Johnson (johnsonni@pcsb.org)

Teachers conduct frequent data chats with scholars to offer support for student achievement and individualized goal setting.

Person Responsible Nicole Johnson (johnsonni@pcsb.org)

Administrators monitor classrooms, provide constructive feedback and participate in teacher reflection to increase effective teaching practices.

Person Responsible Nicole Johnson (johnsonni@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize formative and summative assessments data to determine areas of low proficiency and remediation needs for scholars

Person Responsible Nicole Johnson (johnsonni@pcsb.org)

Teachers committed to attending district provided professional development.

Person Responsible Nicole Johnson (johnsonni@pcsb.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The referral percentage for AA Scholars (767 scholars) earning one or more ODR's is 29% (230 scholars) as compared to all other sub-groups (538 scholars) earning 6% (31 scholars) ODR's. The current 23% gap will be decreased to 18% as measured by the end of the year data from school profile dashboard.

Measurable Outcome: The referral percentage for AA Scholars (767 scholars) earning one or more ODR's is 29% (230 scholars) as compared to all other sub-groups (538 scholars) earning 6% (31 scholars) ODR's. The current 23% gap will be decreased to 18% as measured by the end of the year data from school profile dashboard.

Monitoring: This data will be monitored weekly and quarterly by the MTSS Team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Expectations and rules are developed and effective procedures for dealing with discipline are established. Expectations are clearly defined, taught, and reinforced. Establish and maintain positive relationships with students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Strategies and actions are based on research and evidence-based nationally recognized programs (PBIS and Restorative Practices). The specific strategies and actions within our SIP were selected to match our school-specific needs based on our review of data utilizing an equity problem-solving process

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration, MTSS Specialist, and Behavior Specialist will facilitate Equity Training for instructional and support staff members during pre-school.
2. During the first 10 days of school, scholars will engage in lessons on common area expectations from the behavior matrix with emphasis on changes in expectations and rules. The Admin. Team will monitor teacher delivery of these lesson plans.
3. Employ the use of the ISD/MTSS Specialist to support school-wide climate, culture, strengthen the MTSS process to provide the necessary safeguards for overall student success.
4. Weekly data analysis of attendance, academics and behavior will drive next steps and student interventions.
5. Administrator will monitor all action steps for implementation, provide feedback and prescribe retraining and/or coaching as needed.

Person Responsible Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education

Area of Focus	Our current level of performance is 56% (from the 2018-19 school profile) as evidenced by the number of students passing AP exams, passing dual-enrollment courses, and/or earning industry certifications.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Gibbs High School will increase accelerated performance levels from 56% to 70% by the end of this school year as evidenced by AP exam scores, dual enrollment grades, and industry certification exams. To achieve this, we will increase the number of CAPE Industry certifications earned from 62(SY 20/21) to 115 (85% increase); increase the percentage of students passing dual enrollment courses from 85% to 92%; increase the number of students earning a qualifying score on an AP exam from 51% to 65%.
Monitoring:	Gibbs will monitor enrollment in AP, Dual Enrollment, and Industry Certification courses, student retention, and preparation for AP and Industry Certification exams.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Hold quarterly PLC's for AP teachers to increase capacity for teaching and learning through culturally-responsive pedagogy and usage of the new AP resources from College Board.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Gibbs High School is committed to eliminating the opportunity gap for students to take accelerated coursework. PSAT scores will be used to determine students who need to enroll in these courses (especially Advanced Placement). Co-enrollment with AVID will support these students as they prepare for AP classes.

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure that all AP teachers have attended the summer institute within 3 years.

Person Responsible Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org)

Enhance monthly AP PLC's to focus on teaching and learning.

Person Responsible Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org)

Increase enrollment opportunities (and decrease the opportunity gap) by encouraging students to enroll in AP courses and supplementing with AVID.

Person Responsible Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org)

Increase enrollment opportunities with Pinellas Technical College so 100% of students can earn dual enrollment, industry certification, or AP credit.

Person Responsible Nicole Johnson (johnsonni@pcsb.org)

Increase ELP opportunities for students to prepare for AP and industry certification exams.

Person Responsible Michele Diaz (diazm@pcsb.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our current level of performance is 55% as evidenced in the 2019 US History EOC data. We expect our performance level to be 62% by May 2022 on the US History EOC.

Measurable Outcome: The proficiency rate on the 2021 US History EOC will increase by 7% by May 2022.

Monitoring: Monitoring will occur through administrative walkthroughs, formative assessments, progress monitoring, PLC and collaborative planning documents.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dejuan Patrick (patrickd@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Leadership will support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners that differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the various needs of each student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: All scholar proficiency levels will be placed in American History Honors course to ensure all students engage in standards base instruction, differentiation and scaffolding will be necessary to meet the various needs of the each individual learner.

Action Steps to Implement

American History Instructors will engage in common planning PLC's to review pacing and devise an instructional plan of action based on curriculum guide pacing, content resources, and formative assessments.

Person Responsible Dejuan Patrick (patrickd@pcsb.org)

Literacy Coach will support scholars below proficiency in their reading courses by providing students wit opportunities to engage in relevant material to support their background knowledge in their AH course.

Person Responsible Dejuan Patrick (patrickd@pcsb.org)

AH Instructor will engage in data chats with students to ensure they are fully aware of the performance towards tested standards and devise an action plan to address area of deficiency.

Person Responsible Dejuan Patrick (patrickd@pcsb.org)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our current level of performance is 34% as evidenced in the 2019 Biology EOC data. We expect our performance level to be 41% by May 2022 on the Biology EOC.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of all students achieving biology proficiency enrolled in Biology classes will increase from 34% to 41% as measured by Biology E.O.C. scores.

Monitoring: Monitoring will occur via classroom common teacher formative and summative assessments, cycle 2 assessment, and Pre-AP classroom assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michael Machado (machadom@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Support staff to utilize data to organize scholars to interact with content in manners which differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of scholar. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources and Pre-AP Framework.”

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Proficiency data reflects the need to implement the above mentioned strategy. Enhance staff capacity to identical critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources and Pre-AP framework.

Action Steps to Implement

Biology Instructors will engage in common planning PLC's, district Pre-AP PLC's, and facilitated planning to incorporate AVID's WICOR learning support strategies and Pre-AP shared principles. Review pacing and devise an instructional plan of action based on curriculum guide pacing, content resources, and formative assessments. Administrator will monitor classrooms, provide constructive feedback to teachers and collaborate to determine next steps.

Person Responsible Michael Machado (machadom@pcsb.org)

Literacy Coach will support scholars below proficiency in their reading courses by providing students wit opportunities to engage in relevant material to support their background knowledge in their Biology course.

Person Responsible Michael Machado (machadom@pcsb.org)

Instructor will engage in data chats with students to ensure they are fully aware of the performance towards tested standards and devise an action plan to address area of deficiency.

Person Responsible Michael Machado (machadom@pcsb.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the data for the previous SY, it was determined that of the total 1146 scholars at GHS, 454 (40%) of them have a 90% or lower Attendance rate. The breakdown for this 454 (40%) is as follows - 9th - 77 (17%), 10th - 144 (32%), 11th - 110 (24%) and 12th - 123 (27%).

Measurable Outcome: Based on the 454 (40%) of our scholars have an Attendance rate of 90% or lower our goal is to decrease the number of scholars 454 (40%) that earning an Attendance Rate of 90% or lower to 35%. We will pay specific interest to our 10th graders 144 (13%).

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored weekly though our MTSS Meetings utilizing school profile data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Scholars falling below the desired effect will receive a tier 2 intervention provided by their school counselor and assistant principal. Various checks will employed to address the scholar's specific needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Each scholar will require differentiated support specific to their area of deficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Scholars that are exhibiting Attendance concerns will be referred to the Child Study team for necessary interventions.

Person Responsible Dejuan Patrick (patrickd@pcsb.org)

Weekly monitoring of attendance data during the MTSS meetings to identify struggling scholars.

Person Responsible Dejuan Patrick (patrickd@pcsb.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#8. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our current level of performance is 19% proficiency as demonstrated on the FSA ELA. Our goal is to increase to 30%. The problem/gap is occurring because restorative practices, standards base planning and equitable student centered instruction with rigor for African American Students is not occurring. If restorative practices, standards base planning and equitable student centered instruction with rigor for African American Students would occur more effectively and efficiently, proficiency would be increased by 12% for AA Scholars across all content areas.

Measurable Outcome: Our current level of performance is 19% proficiency as demonstrated on the FSA ELA. Our goal is to increase to 30%.

Monitoring: This areas will be monitored through common assessment, cycle assessment, and summative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Increase instructional use of restorative practices, collaboration amongst reading instructors and core content instructors (ELA, Science, and Social Studies).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Instructors are the key component to student success, positive relations and differentiated of standards base instruction is the driving force for academic growth for AA Students.

Action Steps to Implement

Appropriate utilization of state and district curriculum resources, pacing, standards, goals and scale.

Person Responsible Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

Proper utilization of district secondary resources and professional development opportunities.

Person Responsible Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

Through common planning content specific instructors will employ standards base, student centered instruction.

Person Responsible Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

Continuing to strengthen school-wide us of AVID WICOR Strategies

Person Responsible Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

#9. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our current level of proficiency is 32%, as evidenced in FSA ELA. We expect our performance level to be 42% by the end of the 2021-2022 school term. The problem/gap is occurring because standards-based planning and student center instruction with rigor for ESE students is not occurring. If standards-based planning and student-centered instruction with rigor for ESE Students would occur, proficiency would be increased by 10%.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of ESE students below ELA proficiency will increase from 32% to 42%, as measured by FSA ELA Data.

Monitoring: Monitoring will occur via teacher assessments, cycle assessments and a variety of other formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dejuan Patrick (patrickd@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. Ensure that students requiring ESE services receive instruction designed to teach students to advocate for their academic, social and emotional needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The problem/gap is occurring because standards-based planning and student-centered instruction with rigor for ESE students is not occurring.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement a process for placing students requiring ESE services in master schedules first in order to optimize service delivery.

Person Responsible Dejuan Patrick (patrickd@pcsb.org)

Provide for ongoing collaboration with all stakeholders including general education teachers, administrators, parents and school-based staff that support the student.

Person Responsible Dejuan Patrick (patrickd@pcsb.org)

Teach rules and expectations and then provide opportunities for students to show understanding by monitoring own behavior and/or by responding to positive behavior supports and interventions.

Person Responsible Dejuan Patrick (patrickd@pcsb.org)

Plan intentionally for specially designed instruction to address IEP goals and grade level standards.

Person Responsible Dejuan Patrick (patrickd@pcsb.org)

Strengthen school wide use of AVID WICOR Strategies

Person Responsible Dejuan Patrick (patrickd@pcsb.org)

Administrator will monitor all action steps for implementation, provide feedback and prescribe retraining and/or coaching as needed.

Person Responsible Dejuan Patrick (patrickd@pcsb.org)

Following DWT, ESE teachers will participate in monthly data chats to monitor SDI and student goals.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#10. Other specifically relating to Family Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Family engagement is essential for supporting the success of all students. When the focus is on building trusting relationships and connecting family engagement to student learning, and when it builds the capacity of educators and families to work together, family engagement can lead to a school-family partnership that can positively impact student outcomes and close achievement gaps.

Measurable Outcome:

The family/student satisfaction evaluation increases from the beginning of the year to the end of the year by 10%

Monitoring:

Increased attendance at family engagement events evidenced by sign in sheets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Families will feel confident talking with teachers and administrators and will advocate for all students; teachers will reach out to every family and will be comfortable workings as partners; administrators will provide leadership and support for family engagement and will assure families are partners in supporting student achievement; students will know their families are welcome and will feel their heritage and their families respected at school; staff will know they are valued by school administration for their role in engaging families and will take initiative to welcome families; and the greater community will feel they are an integral part of the school family/ community.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Educators use one directional broadcast communication, along with two-way communication with families, to share student’s progress and school processes/practices

Action Steps to Implement

- Classroom teachers use Class Dojo, student agendas, online platforms and/or emails to regularly communicate with families
- Classroom teachers will input data promptly in FOCUS so that families may see timely student information
 - Parent-Teacher Conferences will be held on a regular basis- set expectation for number
 - Use School Messenger calls from Principal with school and district updates- set expectation for number

- Use Peachjar flyers as another way to communicate with families
- Keep website updated with pertinent dates, resources, information
- Use School Social Media to keep families informed, possibly even having Facebook Live events at the grade or classroom level
- Implement a policy that family inquiries (email, phone, other) are responded to within 1 business day
- All communication from the school recognizes the diverse languages of the families and is delivered appropriately

Person Responsible

Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

#11. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

Employ the use of the ISD/MTSS Specialist to support school-wide climate, culture, strengthen the MTSS process to provide the necessary safeguards for overall student success.

Person Responsible

Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

#12. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: The acceleration participation for GHS scholars (461) is made up of 300 (65.1%) Non-black scholars and 161 (34.9%) Black scholars. Currently their is a 30% gap for AA scholars participating in Accelerated coursework.

Measurable Outcome: The acceleration participation for GHS scholars (461) is made up of 300 (65.1%) Non-black scholars and 161 (34.9%) Black scholars. Currently their is a 30% gap for AA scholars participating in Accelerated coursework. The current gap of 30% will be decreased to 10% as measured by the end of the year data from school profiles.

Monitoring: Administration will monitoring the Master Schedule to ensure all targeted scholars are enrolled in one or more Acceleration courses. Administration will also Monitor the progress of scholars in the accelerated courses.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Consistent use of the AVID Scholar selection criteria for GHS to increase enrollment in the AVID elective course to support scholars in the acceleration pathway.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: AVID is an evidence based program that supports scholars that are falling below our targeted group, but show the individual determination necessary for academic success.

Action Steps to Implement

Open enrollment opportunities for ALL scholars.

Person Responsible Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

Educational leaders will meet with each scholar on the AP Potential Report and scholars that are excelling academically.

Person Responsible Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

Continue promoting awareness to ALL stakeholders (teachers, families, etc.)

Person Responsible Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

Members of the AVID SITE will provide AVID WICOR Strategies Professional Development throughout the year to support instructional staff with the implementation of strategies into their instruction.

Person Responsible Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Jonathan C. Gibbs High School's discipline data rate is 3.8 per 100 scholars, this rate is greater than the 3.3 per 100 scholars for the state of Florida. We will continue to monitor the number of office discipline referrals written for violent acts. Collectively, we will employ restorative practices to address student to student conflicts and reintegration techniques for students returning to class or to school after discipline infractions. This will allow our scholars the opportunity to make the necessary adjustment to their behaviors and allow faculty and staff the opportunity to address the root cause of the problem, therefore, reducing the likelihood of repeated misconduct and broken relationships.

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.

Gibbs High School will effectively communicate with families about their students' progress, school processes/practices, and all school related activities. This communication will be facilitated through school messenger communications, the school website, and social media outlets. GHS will purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to advocate for their students academic, social, and emotional needs. Faculty and staff will intentionally building positive relationships with families, community partners, and all stakeholders through relevant school activities.

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

Faculty, staff, scholars, parents, outside groups/organizations, volunteers, community organizations, and businesses will be called upon by this administration to support school-wide initiatives that will assist in maintaining our positive school culture and school community.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$77,925.18
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			1531 - Gibbs High School	Title, I Part A		\$77,925.18
<i>Notes: Literacy Coach</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$82,330.13
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			1531 - Gibbs High School	Title, I Part A		\$82,330.13
<i>Notes: Math Coach</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education				\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies				\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				\$0.00
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American				\$0.00
9	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
10	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Family Engagement				\$0.00
11	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation				\$25,503.02
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			1531 - Gibbs High School	Title, I Part A		\$25,503.02
<i>Notes: Instructional Staff Developer</i>						
12	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity				\$0.00
Total:					\$185,758.33	