Hillsborough County Public Schools

Gaither High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Gaither High School

16200 N DALE MABRY HWY, Tampa, FL 33618

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Thomas Morrill

Start Date for this Principal: 11/13/2013

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
2020-21 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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (53%)
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 Hillsborough 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

Gaither High School

16200 N DALE MABRY HWY, Tampa, FL 33618

[no web address on file]

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	No	51%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

Gaither High School will provide innovative and rigorous instruction in a collaborative environment to prepare all students to be productive citizens and ensure college and career readiness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To Improve the planning and implementation of instruction through engaging lessons commensurate with content standards and clear learning objectives.

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
Morrill, Thomas	Principal	Oversees the total operation of the school. Mr. Morrill is the instructional leader supporting BEST instructional strategies to improve student learning at the highest levels.
Weeks, Kelleigh	SAC Member	SAC Chair, Science Classroom teacher. Responsible for conducting SAC meetings, setting SAC agenda with member input, and editing SIP. Responsible for teaching students in Earth Space Science and Astronomy H using site/district implementation goals.
Wickham, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	APC, SAC member, ILT member. Responsible for curriculum implementation via APC role, input on SAC and ILT teams. Also responsible for implementing BEST strategies and supporting faculty in meeting school goals.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 11/13/2013, Thomas Morrill

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

80

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,096

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

19

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

4

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	537	539	528	484	2088
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160	177	198	213	748
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	66	41	34	199
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	55	86	38	267
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	121	82	63	377
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	96	0	0	199
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	66	0	0	165
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	36	27	23	115

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	23	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 11/2/2021

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	486	513	493	463	1955
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	157	174	167	669
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	2	3	17
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	85	91	84	378
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	66	0	0	156

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	4	1	2	3	10

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	24	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	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	486	513	493	463	1955
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	157	174	167	669
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	2	3	17
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	85	91	84	378
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	66	0	0	156

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	4	1	2	3	10

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	24	0	0	0	24
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 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				56%	56%	56%	55%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	54%	51%	51%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	41%	42%	41%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				54%	49%	51%	54%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains				38%	48%	48%	43%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	45%	45%	38%	45%	45%
Science Achievement				72%	69%	68%	62%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				75%	75%	73%	74%	73%	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	54%	55%	-1%	55%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	54%	53%	1%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

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	69%	66%	3%	67%	2%
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	72%	73%	-1%	70%	2%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	35%	63%	-28%	61%	-26%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	60%	57%	3%	57%	3%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Spring are FSA and EOCs.
ELA fall/winter using Achieve 3000 on track
Junior/Senior using Achieve 3000 for all metrics
Math/Science/US History baseline and mid-year district provided formative assessments.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26%	32%	48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	21%	37%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	30%	21%
	English Language Learners	3%	7%	9%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	47%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	43%	37%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	50%	10%
	English Language Learners	27%	46%	42%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35%	40%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	37%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	35%	39%	26%
	English Language Learners	24%	38%	29%
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42%	45%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28%	34%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	49%	21%
	English Language Learners	13%	13%	21%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	35%	18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	34%	13%
	Students With Disabilities	23%	34%	20%
	English Language Learners	26%	34%	17%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%	32%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	31%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	31%	31%	58%
	English Language Learners	29%	33%	29%
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	50%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	0%

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6%	11%	11%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	0%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	16%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	2%	8%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28%	36%	17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	36%	15%
	Students With Disabilities	31%	41%	35%
	English Language Learners	24%	37%	10%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	30%	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	28%	30%	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	27%	36%	N/A
	English Language Learners	20%	25%	N/A
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32%	56%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	54%	68%
	Students With Disabilities	31%	53%	49%
	English Language Learners	28%	44%	38%

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4%	11%	14%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	0%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	15%	22%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	4%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27%	33%	7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27%	34%	7%
	Students With Disabilities	21%	29%	10%
	English Language Learners	30%	37%	11%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30%	25%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	19%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	26%	33%	0%
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27%	51%	83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	42%	83%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	45%	25%
	English Language Learners	25%	33%	100%

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	22	35	30	20	29	30	34	46		92	22
ELL	22	42	46	20	23	25	31	55		98	46
ASN	76	54		33			85	94		100	55
BLK	30	39	39	13	12	12	41	54		100	12
HSP	41	41	34	26	20	22	48	71		95	47

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	73	68		54	53		79	79		100	42
WHT	61	55	33	41	25	19	71	79		96	52
FRL	37	41	38	22	20	21	47	69		94	39

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	29	38	31	30	52	47	46	48		85	11
ELL	21	39	30	36	55		46	36		91	33
ASN	74	64		79	44		90	82		95	57
BLK	31	41	33	37	41	58	57	67		93	33
HSP	54	48	45	55	40	50	74	66		91	27
MUL	73	55		50	27		56	80		94	60
WHT	62	49	33	57	35	38	72	85		91	49
FRL	48	47	39	49	38	48	68	65		88	30

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	18	39	32	32	34	26	31	44		75	19
ELL	21	44	42	35	47	40	32	33		89	36
ASN	71	68		70	53		75	83		100	58
BLK	28	40	33	37	41	42	30	63		86	31
HSP	52	47	41	47	40	29	61	67		90	38
MUL	50	50		71	50		80	100		86	26
WHT	64	56	45	64	46	46	70	85		96	43
FRL	45	48	41	46	42	36	50	64		89	33

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	515
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	62
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	44
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	69
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	52
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 Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

We are below average in the Algebra EOC.
We are below average in our FSA Reading scores.
We are still seeing a drop in AP and Industry Certifications.

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

FSA Algebra 1 EOC %3 or above dropped from 41 to 35 in 2019. We did have an influx of other language learners, mostly Spanish speakers. Gaither is still experiencing a high level of English Language Learner enrollment. We are continuing to offer Algebra IA and IB to assist students who have entered without the prerequisite understanding of Algebra and to assist our students who are simultaneously learning English.

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

We are utilizing Algebra I A and Algebra I B to assist students in gaining a deeper understanding of the algebra principles. The math department is working to add resource algebra classes. This has worked in middle schools and they believe it can support our high school students.
The English department has requested access to Achieve 3000 which they feel will assist in raising those scores.
We have added additional industry certifications as well as focusing on the rigor required for students to pass their certification exams.

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

From the 2019 assessments Biology has increased the most.
History has also increased and has a high success rate.

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

The biology teachers are using data points, examining standards and planning together to increase the scores.

The history teachers also use data points gathered throughout the year as well as exam standards and plan together to work on increasing scores and student achievement.

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

Teachers will be using engaging standards based lessons and will be planning together to accelerate student learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Monthly professional development will be offered to teachers. Site teacher leaders will be leading the PD in best practices, new research, and classroom strategies to assist teachers in accelerating our students.

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

On site PD will be continuing and ongoing. Team/content area planning is being utilized and will continue.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Scores in math and reading reflect that these areas need focus. Reading and math will effect other content areas such as science and social studies and effects advanced placement/industry certifications.
Measurable Outcome:	The school plans to see a 1-2% increase in students passing math EOCs and FSA reading.
Monitoring:	This area will be monitored by math and reading teachers/PLC as well as administrative team via testing results including formative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rebecca Wickham (rebecca.wickham@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Improve the planning and implementation of instruction through engaging lessons commensurate with content standards and clear learning objectives. Math department is also working to implement math resource classes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The faculty and administration has agreed that as a school we need to focus on engaging lessons that are based in the content standards. Clear learning objectives help students to focus on the lesson at hand and also keep teachers focused on the standard. Engagement will deepen student learning and improve student outcomes. Math resource classes have been found effective in middle schools and the math department feels they can also be effective in high schools.

Action Steps to Implement

Social Studies is implementing PLCs across content with the goals of an 80% pass rate on EOC with a focus on 75% accuracy is analyzing Political Cartoons, Maps, Graphs, and Charts for the EOC. Improve performance of the bottom quartile's performance on reading primary and secondary documents. Being able to identify main ideas in these documents.

Person Responsible	Ryne Lojacono (ryne.lojacono@hcps.net)

Science is continuing content area PLCs with data reviews. Biology will improve the EOC pass rate by 5% from 2020/2021 school year, with PLC focus on student data from baseline and formative assessments from 9/1/2021 to 5/28/2022. AP courses will increase pass rate by 5% from 2020/2021 school year. AP courses will use Mastering programs with critical units and AP courses will complete CollegeBoard progress checks for each unit. AP Chemistry & Physics will offer Saturday tutoring as long as 5 students sign up.9/1/2021 to 5/1/2022. Bottom quartile improve by 5% from previous school year. All teachers will identify their students who are in the bottom quartile. All teachers will offer additional or tailored work for their bottom quartile. PLCs will focus on assisting and identifying areas of improvement in bottom quartile thru common assessment. DH Kathy Cutro also monitoring.

Person Responsible	Catherine Lee (catherine.lee@hcps.net)

English/ELA is implementing content area PLC with strategic goals focusing on errors/areas of improvement as identified from common baseline assessments and prior test scores. The three instructional goals for writing are as follows: 1. students will be able to demonstrate mastery in a multi-paragraph essay. 2. students will be able to create an argumentative essay with an arguable claim, multiple pieces of support evidence and a strong counterclaim. 3. students will be able to proof-read, edit

and revise their writing to minimize mistakes and improve overall quality of writing. Three Instructional Goals for Literacy Instruction are as follows: 1. Students will be able to explain how the structural elements of a novel contribute to the overall effect 2. Students will be able to analyze and interpret character development in a work of literature. 3. Students will be able compare and contrast characters, themes, and plots from various literary works.

Person Responsible   Lauren Sparks (lauren.sparks@hcps.net)

Post Secondary Readiness: We are working to improve our school-wide data in our College and Career Acceleration (AP scores and Industry Certifications namely). We have a new engineering academy to improve readiness for entry into engineering fields after graduation. Furthermore, different departments have identified how they can improve student readiness through AP courses and assisting students to achieve grade level reading, writing and math skills to prepare them for post-secondary education. (See other action areas) This will be achieved using common assessment data planning via appropriate PLCs.

Person Responsible   Thomas Morrill (thomas.morrill@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Overall, Gaither ranks in the lower category of school incidents. Last year, property incidents were the highest category for discipline. The school is focusing on students being on time to class and in class for the duration of the class period. This will impact property damage situations as student will not be out in the hallways during class time. This will also reduce the opportunity for students to be using tobacco/vaping products as well as the opportunity for physical conflicts.

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.

Gaither has a cultural priority for all stakeholders to focus on. This year our priority is: "To provide a positive, healthy, and ongoing school culture which addresses the social, emotional, and physical needs of our

students, teachers and staff."
At GHS we promote a positive school culture by offering many activities and clubs with a wide range of interests. Our clubs/activities are very diverse to match the diverse population at Gaither.
Gaither's guidance department also offers various meetings for like minded students for support as well as socialization.

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

SAC - all stakeholders represented. Work to collaborate on solutions to problems on campus.
PTSA - all stakeholders represented. Work to collaborate on how to support students, faculty and staff.
Faculty/Staff - work collaboratively with students and parents to have positive classroom culture and foster a mutual respect that results in a positive classroom environment.
Student Government - students work collaboratively to support school spirit at GHS via school events with student input.
Steering Committee - faculty/staff stakeholders working with administration to improve any issues that arise and find solutions to any ongoing problems.
Culture and Climate Resource Teacher - works with the administrative team to provide activities, incentives, and other supports for students to enhance the school culture and climate

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00