

Pinellas County Schools

Gibbs High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	8
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Gibbs High School

850 34TH ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33711

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brown, Barry	Principal	As the principal, I partner with faculty and staff members to set measurable goals to support teaching and learning. While also overseeing the day to operations to ensure all members of our school community feel safe, appreciated, and supported.
Johnson, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Johnson is the assistant principal for the Business Entrepreneurial 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) and he supervises the English Department.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The Jonthan C. Gibbs High School Site Base Leadership Team, Faculty and Staff will review the School Improvement Plan during pre-school to and provide additional recommendation and feedback. Additional stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide input on the School Improvement Plan during the August SAC Meeting.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, through weekly, walk-through with specific feedback on areas of strength and weakness. Instructors will engage in daily formative assessment to confirm the learning of each standard. All content areas will engage in data chats to assess the effectiveness of their instruction based on classroom summative assessment, and cycle assessment. Student academic performance will be share with all stakeholders quarterly at content team meetings, student grade level meetings, and SAC meetings. Stakeholder input will be documented, and necessary adjustment will be made to support all student achievement goals outline in each SIP Goal.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	75%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C

	2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
 Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	39	47	50	39	51	51	38		
ELA Learning Gains				42			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				28			33		
Math Achievement*	24	36	38	32	38	38	22		
Math Learning Gains				45			25		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			34		
Science Achievement*	47	61	64	48	42	40	43		
Social Studies Achievement*	49	63	66	47	47	48	55		
Middle School Acceleration					45	44			
Graduation Rate	92	92	89	91	61	61	90		
College and Career Acceleration	54	69	65	53	70	67	59		
ELP Progress		47	45				50		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	305
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	92

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	93
Graduation Rate	91

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	4	
HSP	66			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	42			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	60			
BLK	34	Yes	3	
HSP	64			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	42			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	39			24			47	49		92	54	
SWD	20			11			37	22		19	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21			10			28	22		33	6	
HSP	54			46			65	68		72	6	
MUL	52			41			55				3	
PAC												
WHT	73			55			86	88		79	6	
FRL	28			17			36	37		45	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	39	42	28	32	45	42	48	47		91	53	
SWD	26	42	38	27	48		27	26		85	17	
ELL												
AMI												
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					
PAC												
WHT	73	58		60	57		80	80		94	82	
FRL	26	35	28	25	42	34	39	45		92	54	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	38	40	33	22	25	34	43	55		90	59	50
SWD	23	31	22	21	30	47	28	38		89	31	
ELL	17	8		30	10							50
AMI												
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					
PAC												
WHT	76	51		55	33		81	89		92	81	
FRL	26	35	29	15	26	36	31	39		88	47	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	42%	48%	-6%	50%	-8%
09	2023 - Spring	38%	46%	-8%	48%	-10%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	53%	-31%	50%	-28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	36%	46%	-10%	48%	-12%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	47%	59%	-12%	63%	-16%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	59%	-9%	63%	-13%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Mathematic proficiency levels are the lowest performing component, math has consistently been the lowest performing component the last four years. Students entering high school below proficiency is the contributing factor and high school math instructors must provide three years of intense standards-based instruction on current standards while also providing differentiated remediation to support each student's area of deficiency. This tedious process takes time and has been the contributing factor to students' low performance in Algebra 1 and Geometry.

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

Mathematics (Algebra and Geometry) has the greatest decline from prior year. Students entering high school below proficiency is the contributing factor and high school math instructors must provide three years of intense standards-based instruction on current standards while also providing differentiated remediation to support each student's area of deficiency.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Mathematics (Algebra and Geometry) has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Again, this is because students entering high school below proficiency is the contributing factor and high school math instructors must provide three years of intense standards-based instruction on current standards while also providing differentiated remediation to support each student's area of deficiency.

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

English/Reading has shown gradual improvement the previous two years. English and intensive reading courses have done much better job of differentiating their instruction to support the students below proficiency. Intensive Reading classes are not just supporting reading fluency but also supporting the infusion of ELA structures and strategies in the instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Mathematics and Science are areas of concern.

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

All tested areas math, ELA/Reading, science, and social studies are areas of concern every school term.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our current proficiency is 41% as evidenced by the FAST PM3 assessment. We expect our proficiency levels to increase to 46% by May 2024 as evidenced by FAST PM3. The past school year demonstrated a 15% increase in proficiency from PM1 in September to PM3 in May, with the bulk of growth taking place between PM2 and PM3. A recognized gap from the previous year between PM1 and PM2 was the faculty's fidelity of implementation of the professional development to support student growth. This improved between PM2 and PM3 and student growth was evident during that time.

Measurable Outcome:

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 will increase from 41% to 46% as measured by the FAST PM3 assessment in May 2024.

Monitoring:

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 PM1 and PM2 testing data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 in alignment with BEST standards. Teachers will use strategies learned from the past year to continue a deep dive into classroom and individual student data as indicated by FAST PM assessments throughout the year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

ELA and reading teachers PLC together monthly around data to determine school-wide trends, areas in need of improvement, and next steps. FAST PM data will drive professional development and collaboration. Administration and department chairs will lead PLC's. Walkthroughs by administration and district specialists will drive specific PLC topics for professional development.

Person Responsible: Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

School-based MTSS Specialists support teachers with data analysis, differentiation, student-based learning, collaborative planning, and monitoring toward mastery of Florida B.E.S.T. Standards.

Person Responsible: Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

ELA and reading teachers provide formative assessments aligned to Florida B.E.S.T. Standards in grades 9-12.

Person Responsible: Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

ELA teachers utilize data collected in the form of student artifacts to determine student needs and adjust instruction. Teachers will share data and student artifacts in PLC's to align instruction based on student needs.

Person Responsible: Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

School-based MTSS Specialists will conduct pull-out work with scholars whose data reflects the need for additional differentiation and support.

Person Responsible: Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will be required to utilize BEST texts from the state list as they learn the BEST benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

9th and 10th grade ELA teachers will consistently use anchor charts, graphic organizers, and critical reading protocols as provided in the district resource notebook to ensure scaffolding and differentiation for student-centered learning.

Person Responsible: Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org)

By When: This will be visible every day in classrooms.

9th and 10th grade ELA teaches will collaboratively develop and adopt a BEST benchmark tracking system and use this to track individual student progress towards benchmark mastery.

Person Responsible: Derek Weston (westond@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our current level of performance is 50% as evidenced by the 2023 US History End of Course (EOC) Exam. We expect our performance level to be 55% by May 2024 on the US History EOC exam.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The proficiency rate on the 2024 US History EOC will increase by 5% by May 2023.

Monitoring:

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 Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Leadership will support faculty members to utilize data to organize students into Collaborative Study Groups (CSG). CSG will allow students to engage in critical thinking through various research based WICOR strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborative Study Groups are student led. CSG engage scholars in critical thinking through various researched based WICOR strategies.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will receive professional development on implementation of CSG. The focus will on developing critical thinking questions, facilitating the group process, monitoring, and feedback.

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

By When: August 10.

Teachers will use district developed mini-assessments to determine if scholars mastered the benchmark.

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

By When: Ongoing.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our current proficiency is 27% as evidenced by the BEST Algebra & Geometry EOC assessment. We expect our proficiency levels to increase to 33% by May 2024 as evidenced by the BEST Algebra and Geometry EOC assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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 will increase from 27% to 33% as measured by the BEST Algebra and Geometry EOC assessment in May 2024.

Monitoring:

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 district cycle assessment test data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 standard-based rigorous activities through the Pre-AP curriculum in alignment with BEST standards. Teachers will use strategies learned from the past year to continue a deep dive into classroom and individual student data as indicated by FAST PM assessments throughout the year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Algebra 1A, Algebra and Geometry teachers PLC together monthly around data to determine school-wide trends, areas in need of improvement, and next steps. Cycle assessment and classroom assessment data will drive professional development and collaboration.

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

By When: Monthly

Staff developers support teachers with data analysis, differentiation, student-based learning, and monitoring toward mastery of Florida B.E.S.T. Standards.

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

By When: Monthly

Algebra 1A, Algebra and Math teachers utilize district created common formative assessments aligned to Florida B.E.S.T. Standards in grades 9-12.

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

By When: As needed

Algebra 1A, Algebra and Geometry teachers utilize data collected in the form of student artifacts to determine student needs and adjust instruction. Teachers will share data and student artifacts in PLC's to align instruction based on student needs.

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

By When: As needed

Algebra 1A, Algebra and Geometry teachers implement district non-negotiables (ie. all scholars use assessment approved reference sheets and calculators) on a daily basis.

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

By When: Daily

Algebra 1A, Algebra and Geometry teachers will participate in quarterly TDEs for on-site professional development quarterly to ensure all teachers and math AP can attend/participate and grow.

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

By When: Quarterly

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our current level of performance is 48% as evidenced by the 2023 Biology End of Course (EOC) Exam. We expect our performance level to be 55% by May 2024 on the Biology EOC exam.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The proficiency rate on the 2024 Biology EOC will increase by 7% by May 2023.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through administrative walk-through's, formative assessments, progress monitoring and collaborative planning documents.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Machado (machadom@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners that differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each student. All Biology teachers will use "Just in Time" professional development to enhance their instructional skills. All Biology teachers will support students with guided data chats that are standards-based for re-teaching followed by reassessments to determine success of re-teaching and inform next steps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Action Steps to Implement:

1. Biology teachers PLC together monthly around data to determine school-wide trends, areas in need of improvement, and next steps. Cycle and common assessments data will drive professional development and collaboration.
2. Staff developers support teachers with data analysis, differentiation, student-based learning, and monitoring toward mastery of all Biology standards.
3. Biology teachers provide formative assessments aligned to Biology Standards in grades 9-12.

4. Biology teachers utilize data collected in the form of student artifacts to determine student needs and adjust instruction. Teachers will share data and student artifacts in PLC's to align instruction based on student needs.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our current level of performance is 34% proficiency as demonstrated on The FAST ELA. Our goal is to increase it to 41%. The problem/gap is occurring because planning for benchmarks/standards base instruction and high yielding scholar engagement techniques that also improve the classroom climate and culture for African American Scholars must occur 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 7%

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 34% proficiency as demonstrated on The FAST ELA. Our goal is to increase to 41%.

Monitoring:

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 PM1 and PM2 testing data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 in alignment with BEST standards. Teachers will use strategies learned from the past year to continue a deep dive into classroom and individual student data as indicated by FAST PM assessments throughout the year. MTSS Intervention Teacher will engage in push-ins and pull-outs to support the various needs of individual scholars.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

ELA and reading teachers PLC together monthly around data to determine school-wide trends, areas in need of improvement, and next steps. FAST PM data will drive professional development and collaboration. Administration and department chairs will lead PLC's. Walkthroughs by administration and district specialists will drive specific PLC topics for professional development.

Person Responsible: Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

School-based MTSS Specialists will conduct pull-out work with scholars whose data reflects the need for additional differentiation and support.

Person Responsible: Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

#6. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Jonathan C. Gibbs High School will increase the scholar experience on our campus through the use of PBIS Rewards System. Increase scholars experience will heighten staff to scholar relationships and student engagement simultaneously.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Staff will align the GHs REP (Respect Excellence and Pride) to the PBIS Rewards System and provide scholars with school wide dollars they can earn daily using the PBIS App. Scholars can use the reward dollars to purchase snack in the school store.

Monitoring:

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

PBIS Rewards App usage data can be monitored daily through the PBIS App daily.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The PBIS Rewards App will be a positive intervention to encourage scholars to exemplified Respect Excellence and Pride on our campus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Improve scholar experience will heighten scholar engagement in the classroom and on campus.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

PBIS Rewards System purchase, training, and implementation must take place.

Person Responsible: Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

By When: each quarter - 9weeks

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We expect our FAST ELA performance level for ESE students to be 42% or higher by the end of the 2023-2024 school term. The problem/gap is occurring because standards-based planning and student center instruction with rigor for ESE students is not occurring. If standards-based planning and student-centered instruction occurs, the subgroup will increase in proficiency. rigor for ESE Students would occur, proficiency

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 less than 41% proficiency as demonstrated on The FAST ELA. Our goal is to increase to 42% or higher.

Monitoring:

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 PM1 and PM2 testing data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 in alignment with BEST standards. Teachers will use strategies learned from the past year to continue a deep dive into classroom and individual student data as indicated by FAST PM assessments throughout the year. MTSS Intervention Teacher will engage in push-ins and pull-outs to support the various needs of individual scholars.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

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

collaboration. Administration and department chairs will lead PLC's. Walkthroughs by administration and district specialists will drive specific PLC topics for professional development.

Person Responsible: Barry Brown (brownba@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Title 1 Comprehensive Needs Assessment was utilized to document funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on need. Quarterly Title 1 school meetings are held to monitor program progress and ensure allocated funds serving their designed purpose.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, through weekly, walk-through with specific feedback on areas of strength and weakness. Instructors will engage in daily formative assessment to confirm the learning of each standard. All content areas will engage in data chats to assess the effectiveness of their instruction based on classroom summative assessment, and cycle assessment. Student academic performance will be share with all stakeholders quarterly at content team meetings, student grade level meetings, and SAC meetings. Stakeholder input will be documented, and necessary adjustment will be made to support all student achievement goals outline in each SIP Goal.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

GHS will continue to work to differentiate the mean of communication with parent to ensure our partnership is healthy and communication is ongoing based on our parent survey results, weekly activity updates, Bi-weekly academic progress reports, quarterly newsletter, family college and semester parent resource nights. We utilize school website and social media platforms to highlight and celebrate the

great things happening at
Jonathan C. Gibbs High School.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

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 tasks and rigorous activities in each curriculum areas in alignment with each core content standards. Teachers will use strategies learned from the past year to continue a deep dive into classroom and individual student data as indicated by formative and summative assessments throughout the year. MTSS Intervention Teacher will engage in push-ins and pull-outs to support the various needs of individual scholars. The AVID Program will continue to increase level of support for scholars in honors, AP, and dual enrollment courses.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA