# Gibbs High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# 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: 5/12/2020

| | |
|---|---|
| **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 |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2021-22 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>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: C (47%)<br><br>2018-19: C (47%)<br><br>2017-18: C (49%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Central |
| **Regional Executive Director** | <u>Lucinda Thompson</u> |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | ATSI |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click here</u>. | |

## 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

# 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) | **2021-22 Title I School** | **2021-22 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 | 75% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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**
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| 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. |
| 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 for curriculum, he also supervises the social studies and ESE 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**
Tuesday 5/12/2020, Barry Brown

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

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

2

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

73

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

1,195

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

11

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

10

**Demographic Data**

## Early Warning Systems

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 364 | 363 | 288 | 246 | 1261 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 193 | 164 | 150 | 652 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 61 | 50 | 17 | 173 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 61 | 55 | 16 | 200 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 44 | 27 | 8 | 136 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 174 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 123 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 286 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 225 | 198 | 199 | 175 | 797 |

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 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 | | |

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

Tuesday 7/12/2022

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 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 | 77 | 144 | 110 | 123 | 454 |
| One or more suspensions | 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 | 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 FSA ELA assessment | 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 | 139 | 100 | 106 | 89 | 434 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | |

**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 | 292 | 343 | 261 | 250 | 1146 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 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 | 39 | 24 | 15 | 12 | 90 |
| 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 FSA ELA assessment | 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 | 139 | 100 | 106 | 89 | 434 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**School Data Review**
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 39% | 51% | 51% | | | | 42% | 56% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 42% | | | | | | 42% | 51% | 51% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 28% | | | | | | 28% | 43% | 42% |
| Math Achievement | 33% | 38% | 38% | | | | 31% | 45% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | 45% | | | | | | 42% | 44% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | | | | | | 42% | 41% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | 50% | 42% | 40% | | | | 41% | 64% | 68% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 50% | 47% | 48% | | | | 53% | 71% | 73% |

**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 |

| 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 |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 43% | 62% | -19% | 67% | -24% |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 60% | 70% | -10% | 70% | -10% |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 21% | 55% | -34% | 61% | -40% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 40% | 56% | -16% | 57% | -17% |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 26 | 42 | 38 | 27 | 48 | | 27 | 26 | | 85 | 17 |
| ASN | 70 | 50 | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 18 | 32 | 28 | 17 | 34 | 31 | 27 | 30 | | 89 | 33 |
| HSP | 43 | 52 | | 54 | 55 | | 64 | 83 | | 89 | 75 |
| MUL | 50 | 23 | | 57 | | | 87 | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 58 | | 60 | 57 | | 80 | 80 | | 94 | 82 |
| FRL | 26 | 35 | 28 | 25 | 42 | 34 | 39 | 45 | | 92 | 54 |

| 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 |
| 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 |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI |
| 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 | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 467 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
| --- | --- |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 93% |

| Subgroup Data | |
| --- | --- |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 37 |
| 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 | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 60 |
| 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 | 34 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 64 |
| 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 | 54 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Multiracial Students | |
|---|---|
| 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 | 73 |
| 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 | 42 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis**
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

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

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 2022 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?**

The contributing factors are planning for benchmarks/standards base instruction and high yielding student engagement techniques that improve the classroom climate for our low performing ESSA Groups is not occurring consistently. Planning for benchmarks/standards base instruction and high yielding student engagement techniques that also improve the classroom climate and culture for our ESSA Groups would occur more effectively and efficiently proficiency levels would increase.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 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?**

Planning for benchmarks/standards base instruction and high yielding student engagement techniques that also improve the classroom climate and culture were the contributing factors.

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

1. Benchmarks/Standards-Base Instruction
2. Climate and Culture
3. Scholar Engagement Strategies
4. Standards – Based Planning

**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 engaging in Pre-AP professional development to support their implementation of the Pre-AP instructional framework and utilization of Pre-AP Resources.

**Areas of Focus**
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Our current level of proficiency is 34%, as evidenced in the FSA EOC Math data. We expect our performance level to be 39% by May 2023 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. Include a statement about student achievement in the area of focus. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | The percentage of scholars achieving proficiency will increase from 34% to 39% as measured on the FSA Math EOCs of Algebra 1 and Geometry. Also, 100% of all graduating scholars will pass the Algebra EOC. Geometry EOC or earn a successful concordant score. |
| **Monitoring:** **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Monitoring will occur via teacher assessments, mini cycle assessments, cycle assessments and a variety of other formative assessments. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Nicole Johnson (johnsonni@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Support staff to utilize data to organize scholars to interact with content in manners which differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of scholar (Scaffolding instruction using ALEKS and on grade level remediation using IXL) |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | Learning gains and proficiency reflect the need to implement the above-mentioned strategy |

### Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teachers engage in course-specific PLCs to review assessment data, develop progress monitoring formative assessments, identify trends and next steps.
2. Teachers who teach the same course utilize the same grading scales.
3. Teachers regularly incorporate checks for understanding through formative assessments and use the collected data to gauge scholar progress toward mastery of the course content.
4. Teachers conduct frequent data chats with scholars to offer support for student achievement and individualized goal setting.
5. Administrators monitor classrooms, provide constructive feedback and participate in teacher reflection to increase effective teaching practices.

6. Teachers utilize formative and summative assessments data to determine areas of low proficiency and remediation needs for scholars
7. Teachers committed to attending district provided professional development.
8. All non-advanced course teachers will implement the use of ALBERT IO for scholars at least 30 minutes per week and can be used in all Math courses to strength scholars on the college path.
9. Implement ACT Prep Bootcamps prior to every ACT test.
10. Teachers will implement Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards on a daily basis to increase scholar engagement.

**Person Responsible**      Nicole Johnson (johnsonni@pcsb.org)

| **#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA** | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** <br> **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Our current proficiency is 41% as evidenced by the Spring 2022 FSA ELA data. We expected our proficiency levels to 46% by May 2023 on the FAST assessment. 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:** <br> **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | The percentage of all students reaching proficiency on the FSA ELA will increase from 41% to 46% as measured by the FAST assessment in May 2023 |
| **Monitoring:** <br> **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Monitoring will occur through administrative walkthroughs, formative assessments, progress monitoring, PLC and collaborative planning documents, and FAST Assessment in May 2023. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** <br> **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | 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:** <br> **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | Learning gains and proficiency data reflect a need to implement the above-mentioned strategy |

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. ELA and reading teachers PLC together monthly around data to determine school-wide trends, areas in need of improvement, and next steps
2. Literacy coaches and staff developers support teachers with differentiation, student-based learning, and monitoring toward mastery of Florida B.E.S.T. Standards
3. ELA and reading teachers provide formative assessments aligned to Florida B.E.S.T. Standards in

grades 6-12.
4. 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**    Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org)

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**<br>**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Our current level of performance is 56% as evidenced in the 2022 US History<br>EOC data. We expect our performance level to be 62% by May 2023 on the US History EOC. |
| **Measurable Outcome:**<br>**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | The proficiency rate on the 2021 US History EOC will increase by 6% by May 2023. |
| **Monitoring:**<br>**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | 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:**<br>**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Leadership will support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners that differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the<br>various needs of each student. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. 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)

| #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**<br>**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Our current level of performance is 50% as evidenced in the 2022 Biology EOC data. |
| **Measurable Outcome:**<br>**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | The percentage of all students achieving biology proficiency enrolled in Biology classes will increase from 50% to 55% as measured by Biology E.O.C (End of Course). scores |
| **Monitoring:**<br>**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Monitoring will occur via classroom common teacher formative and summative assessments, cycle assessments |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Michael Machado (machadom@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | 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:**<br>**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | Proficiency data reflects the need to implement the above-mentioned strategy. |

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1.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. Teachers will attend professional development in WICOR strategies and content enhancement routines. Administrators will monitor classrooms, provide constructive feedback to teachers, and collaborate to determine the next steps.
2.Literacy Coach will support scholars below proficiency in their reading courses by providing students with opportunities to engage in relevant material to support their background knowledge in their Biology course
3.The 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.
4. Teachers will use common assessments and will review on a consistent basis to determine the next steps.
5. Administrator will provide actionable feedback to teachers including AVID and WICOR strategies.

| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |
|---|---|

| **#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American** |
|---|

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | Our current level of performance is 19% proficiency as demonstrated on The FSA ELA. Our goal is to increase it to 30%. The problem/gap is occurring because planning for benchmarks/standards base instruction and high yielding student engagement techniques that also improve the classroom climate and culture for African American Students is not occurring consistently. If planning for benchmarks/standards base instruction and high yielding student engagement techniques that also improve the classroom climate and culture for African American Students would occur more effectively and efficiently proficiency levels would increase by 12% |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | Our current level of performance is 19% proficiency as demonstrated on The FSA ELA. Our goal is to increase to 30%. |
| **Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | This areas will be monitored through common assessment, cycle assessment, and summative assessments. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | Increase standards based instruction, student engagement strategies, restorative practices, and effective common planning amongst reading instructors and core content instructors (ELA, Science, Social Studies). |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. | Standards Base Instruction, Climate and culture, Student engagement strategies, and standards base planning are the keys to our AA student academic growth. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Standards Base Instruction
2. Climate and culture
3. Student engagement strategies
4. Standards based planning

**Person Responsible**     [no one identified]

| **#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities** | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**<br>**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Our current level of proficiency is 26%, as evidenced in FSA ELA. We expect our performance level to be 42% by the end of the 2022-2023 school term. The problem/gap is occurring because standards-based<br>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 16%. |
| **Measurable Outcome:**<br>**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | The percent of ESE students below ELA proficiency will increase from 26% to<br>42%, as measured by FAST Assessment. |
| **Monitoring:**<br>**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Monitoring will occur via teacher assessments, cycle assessments and a<br>variety of other formative assessments. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Dejuan Patrick (patrickd@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | 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:**<br>**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Implement a process for placing students requiring ESE services in master schedules first in order to optimize service delivery.
2. Provide for ongoing collaboration with all stakeholders including general education teachers, administrators, parents and school-based staff that support the student.
3. 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.
4. Plan intentionally for specially designed instruction to address IEP goals and grade level standards

5. Administrator will monitor all action steps for implementation, provide feedback and prescribe retraining and/or coaching as needed.
6. Following DWT, ESE teachers will participate in monthly data chats to monitor SDI and student goals.

**Person Responsible**                                        Dejuan Patrick (patrickd@pcsb.org)

| #7. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation |
| --- |

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Our Acceleration for SY 21-22 was 53%, decreasing from 59% the prior year. We expect our acceleration to be 57% for the 22-23 school year as demonstrated by AP qualifying scores, Industry Certifications and Dual Enrollment course grades of a "C" or higher.<br>Our current AP course enrollment is a total of 436 scholars, 38% of whom are African-American, however our total school enrollment is 56% African-American, leaving a 18% gap in African-American representation in AP courses. |
| --- | --- |
| **Measurable Outcome:** **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | We expect our acceleration to be 57% for the 22-23 school year as demonstrated by AP qualifying scores, Industry Certifications and Dual Enrollment course grades of a "C" or higher.<br>Gibbs HS will reduce the 18% opportunity gap for AP course enrollment by 8% for the 2023-24 school year. |
| **Monitoring:** **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Admin and school counselors will monitor AP & Dual Enrollment coursework, Industry Certifications earned. We will also monitor course requests during the registration period in January 2023. Team will use student data to determine additional students who should enroll in AP courses. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Increase enrollment in AVID courses to support students enrolling in an AP course. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | AVID provides additional supports for students by teaching organization, note-taking, and study strategies to be successful in advanced courses. |

| **Action Steps to Implement** |
| --- |
| List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step. |

Conduct targeted recruiting for AVID courses by examining student data.

| **Person Responsible** | Michael Machado (machadom@pcsb.org) |
| --- | --- |

Monitor student success in AP courses by analyzing student grades with midterm progress reports.

| **Person Responsible** | Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org) |
| --- | --- |

## Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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 school culture and environment.**

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.