

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Gaither High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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: 8/2/2022

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2021-22 Title I School | No |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 57% |
| 2021-22 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 | 2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (55%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | ATSI |
| * 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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School 9-12 | No | 57% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 64% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 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.

Gaither High School's instructional practices will provide rigor, knowledge, and skills necessary for students to become responsible citizens and essential components of the community.

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 |
|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Morrill, Thomas | Principal | |
| Wickham, Rebecca | Assistant Principal | |
| Eisenhauer, Jacqueline | Assistant Principal | |
| Dunn, Rubye | Assistant Principal | |
| Harris, Kedric | Assistant Principal | |
| Weeks, Kelleigh | SAC Member | |
| Aldrich, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Lojacono, Ryne | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Martinez, Catherine | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Sparks, Lauren | Teacher, K-12 | |
| McQuay, Marla | School Counselor | |
| Plante, Alexandra | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Carteguena, Carmen | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Dell, Kristy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Feldhaus, Nancy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Hammond, Lauren | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Hirth, Debbie | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Hough, Karen | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Lojacono, Emily | Teacher, K-12 | |
| MacDonald, Jane | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Mazard, Thomas | School Counselor | |
| Minutillo, Ettore | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Montesi, Jonathan | Teacher, K-12 | |
| North, Nelson | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Sinclair, Katherine | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Wilkes, Christina | Teacher, K-12 | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/2/2022, Thomas Morrill

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.*

2

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,113

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

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

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 | 553 | 547 | 507 | 506 | 2113 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 139 | 140 | 189 | 629 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 100 | 98 | 87 | 373 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 64 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 38 | 0 | 54 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 127 | 48 | 0 | 280 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 125 | 30 | 0 | 213 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 44 | |

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 | 41 | 48 | 45 | 82 | 216 |

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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/26/2022

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 | 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 | | |

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 | 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 | |

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 | 51% | 52% | 51% | | | | 56% | 56% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 55% | | | | | | 48% | 54% | 51% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | | | | | | 40% | 41% | 42% |
| Math Achievement | 42% | 39% | 38% | | | | 54% | 49% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | 43% | | | | | | 38% | 48% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | | | | | | 47% | 45% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | 64% | 46% | 40% | | | | 72% | 69% | 68% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 72% | 49% | 48% | | | | 75% | 75% | 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 | 69% | 66% | 3% | 67% | 2% |
| 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 | 72% | 73% | -1% | 70% | 2% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 35% | 63% | -28% | 61% | -26% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 60% | 57% | 3% | 57% | 3% |

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 | 18 | 35 | 26 | 21 | 25 | 25 | 31 | 42 | | 90 | 12 |
| ELL | 32 | 50 | 40 | 30 | 45 | 57 | 47 | 61 | | 83 | 48 |
| ASN | 59 | 64 | | 56 | 57 | | | 86 | | 94 | 71 |
| BLK | 34 | 49 | 53 | 18 | 14 | | 43 | 74 | | 88 | 23 |
| HSP | 44 | 53 | 41 | 38 | 40 | 51 | 60 | 64 | | 92 | 46 |
| MUL | 58 | 58 | | 62 | 60 | | 71 | 76 | | 95 | 50 |
| WHT | 62 | 59 | 43 | 51 | 49 | 33 | 72 | 83 | | 94 | 51 |
| FRL | 40 | 50 | 41 | 35 | 40 | 44 | 54 | 63 | | 90 | 41 |
| 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 |

| 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 |
| 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 |
| 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 |

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 | 56 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 64 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 615 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 95% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 33 |
| 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 | 51 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 70 |
| 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 | 44 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 54 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 66 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 60 |
| 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 | 51 |
| 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?

We are below average in the Algebra and Geometry EOC.

We are below average in our FSA Reading scores.

We are seeing a small rise in our industry certifications and AP points. Certification teachers worked over the last year to prepare students for the exams this year (some programs require more than 1 year to complete) and we should see an upward trend in this area.

Social Studies scores dropped slightly.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math still shows the greatest area for growth. While there were large gains in Math, we are still below the district and state average for level 4 & 5, while above for level 1 & 2.

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 still receiving an influx of English Language Learners. Our math teachers have updated curriculum and a new district progression plan. Furthermore, the technology has been updated at GHS and math teachers now have more access to technology to differentiate and support learning of our diverse student population.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

From the 2022 assessments math has increased the most.
Science and ELA have also improved.

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

Math has been working together to PLC often and has offered additional ELP for students. There have been changes in which math subjects are being taught by which math teacher. Furthermore, the addition of technology to the school has enabled the math teachers to integrate technology that supports diverse learners.

Science has been using various resources that the district offered to support the diverse learners in a more targeted fashion. Science also PLCs regularly and are also utilize digital resources more.

ELA has created a solid PLC groups and have been working together to improve instructional outcomes.

ELA has also taken advantage of the new digital resources available as well as maintaining writing skills

in an organic fashion.

All groups planned using data points gathered throughout the year with mid-year testing.

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 utilizing data points 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. Furthermore, we have 2 teacher leaders who will be working with teachers to help improve their teaching practices.

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.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Scores in math and reading reflect that these areas need focus. The improvement from the previous year shows that utilizing data driven PLCs and focusing on standards based instruction has benefitted the students vis a vis their learning gains. Reading and math will effect other content areas such as science and social studies and effects advanced placement/industry certifications.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The school plans to see a 1-2% increase in students passing math EOCs and FSA reading.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area will be monitored by math and reading teachers/PLC as well as administrative team and instructional leadership team via testing results including formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Wickham (rebecca.wickham@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Improve the planning and implementation of instruction through engaging lessons commensurate with content standards and clear learning objectives. Improve planning utilizing data driven PLCs and implementation of new resources/curriculum. ELP will also be utilized in these departments to support struggling students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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 and which are planned using PLCs that are data driven and clear. . 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.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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

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.

College and Career Readiness: We are expanding our certification programs to help our students prepare for career life. We are offering a new program that allows certifications in MS as well as other computer programs. We are working to continue to improve our certifications in other CTE and Business areas including automotive, television production, MS Office, engineering, and veterinary fields. We are working to offer a diverse set of courses to widen the reach of our certification programs. Our guidance counselors are also working with students to enroll them in AP and dual enrollment courses to accelerate their preparations for college as well as earn college credits for their courses. Our Department Heads in these areas will be monitoring progress and reporting to ILT and SAC.

Person Responsible Rebecca Wickham (rebecca.wickham@hcps.net)

SWD (ESSA subgroup) - we have been working to revamp our MTSS team and protocols. We are working to implement more efficient strategies in tracking our students that need additional supports. Furthermore, the team is streamlining those supports to facilitate better supports using evidence based SWD supports. We are also revamping our committees that work to support behavioral needs. Many of our SWD students also have behavioral needs which our team is looking to address using multiple strategies and tiers of support. We are working to provide more robust wrap around services to support students so that they can achieve mastery. All faculty have been trained in these new protocols and continuing PD will be offered. These working committees will be reporting to ILT/SAC.

Person Responsible Rebecca Wickham (rebecca.wickham@hcps.net)

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.

We have a new program called being "Cowboy Classy". This program is to encourage students to follow expectations. Part of the new system is a significant rewards program for students. Teachers are able to reward good behavior in students and students earn rewards that they are interested in.

Achievements are being celebrated throughout the school, whether it is a personal achievement, team achievement or school wide achievement.

Clubs will be active this year and are recruiting new students.

Spirit days and themed sports nights have already been planned and are being advertised by the student government.

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

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. Spirit Days are being planned and advertised.

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