



## Gilbert High School

840 Main Street  
Gilbert, SC 29054

<b>Grades</b>	9-12 High School	
<b>Enrollment</b>	941 Students	
<b>Principal</b>	E. Ann O'Cain	803-821-1900
<b>Superintendent</b>	Dr. Karen C. Woodward	803-821-1000
<b>Board Chair</b>	Cynthia S. Smith	803-957-5095

# THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA 2012 ANNUAL SCHOOL REPORT CARD



## RATINGS OVER 5-YEAR PERIOD

YEAR	ABSOLUTE RATING	GROWTH RATING
<b>2012</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>At-Risk</b>
2011	Excellent	Below Average
2010	Good	Below Average
2009	Good	At-Risk
2008	Excellent	Average

## DEFINITIONS OF SCHOOL RATING TERMS

- Excellent – School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- Good – School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- Average – School performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- Below Average – School is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- At-Risk – School performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision

## SOUTH CAROLINA PERFORMANCE VISION

By 2020 all students will graduate with the knowledge and skills necessary to compete successfully in the global economy, participate in a democratic society and contribute positively as members of families and communities.

<http://ed.sc.gov>  
<http://www.eoc.sc.gov>

**ABSOLUTE RATINGS OF HIGH SCHOOLS WITH STUDENTS LIKE OURS**

Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	At-Risk
23	6	1	0	0

\* Ratings are calculated with data available by 11/14/2012.

**High School Assessment Program (HSAP) Exam Passage Rate: Second Year Students**

Percent	Our High School			High Schools with Students Like Ours		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
Passed 2 subtests (%)	79.2%	81.6%	81.1%	80.5%	84.2%	84.5%
Passed 1 subtest (%)	13.5%	8.7%	9.2%	11.1%	9.8%	9.7%
Passed no subtests (%)	7.3%	9.7%	9.6%	8.4%	6.7%	6.0%

**HSAP Passage Rate by Spring 2012**

Percent	Our High School	High Schools with Students Like Ours
	90.5%	94.3%

**Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rate**

	Our High School		High Schools with Students Like Ours	
	2011*	2012	2011	2012
Number of Students in Four-Year Cohort	247	242	400	376
Number of Graduates in Cohort	199	196	310	299
Rate	80.6%	81.0%	78.6%	80.0%

\*Used to calculate current ESEA/Federal Accountability Grade.

**Five-Year Graduation Rate**

	Our High School		High Schools with Students Like Ours	
	2011	2012	2011	2012
Number of Students in Cohort	227	249	424	387
Number of Graduates in Cohort	186	204	325	310
Rate	81.9%	81.9%	78.1%	81.0%

**End of Course Tests**

Percent of tests with scores of 70 or above on:	Our High School	High Schools with Students Like Ours*
Algebra 1/Math for the Technologies 2	81.8%	80.8%
English 1	69.7%	71.3%
Biology 1/Applied Biology 2	79.6%	81.8%
US History and the Constitution	59.7%	57.9%
All Tests	74.2%	73.4%

\* High Schools with Poverty Indices of no more than 5% above or below the index for this school.

## Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable N/AV–Not Available N/C–Not Collected N/R–Not Reported I/S–Insufficient Sample

## School Profile

	Our School	Change from Last Year	High Schools with Students Like Ours	Median High School
<b>Students (n=941)</b>				
Retention rate	1.3%	Down from 1.9%	2.4%	3.0%
Attendance rate	95.4%	Up from 94.3%	95.4%	95.3%
Served by gifted and talented program	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV
With disabilities other than speech	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV
Older than usual for grade	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV
Out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for violent and/or criminal offenses	1.4%	Down from 1.7%	0.9%	0.9%
Enrolled in AP/IB programs	24.4%	Up from 13.1%	23.5%	13.4%
Successful on AP/IB exams	46.6%	Up from 43.1%	54.1%	50.9%
Eligible for LIFE Scholarship	56.9%	Up from 51.0%	38.2%	30.1%
Annual dropout rate	2.2%	Up from 1.3%	2.3%	2.3%
Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations	17.6%	Down from 19.7%	1.7%	2.7%
Enrollment in career/technology courses	666	Up from 648	741	395
Students participating in work-based experiences	39.8%	Up from 20.7%	6.6%	7.4%
Career/technology students attaining technical skills	83.2%	Down from 89.2%	84.5%	84.0%
Career/technology completers placed	96.3%	Down from 96.6%	99.5%	98.4%
<b>Teachers (n=69)</b>				
Teachers with advanced degrees	66.7%	Down from 67.6%	67.2%	63.2%
Continuing contract teachers	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV
Teachers returning from previous year	91.1%	Down from 92.7%	89.6%	86.6%
Teacher attendance rate	95.9%	Down from 96.0%	95.3%	95.2%
Average teacher salary*	\$49,971	Up 3.1%	\$48,589	\$47,326
Professional development days/teacher	14.5 days	Up from 9.8 days	9.0 days	9.7 days
<b>School</b>				
Principal's years at school	5.0	Up from 4.0	6.0	4.0
Student-teacher ratio in core subjects	26.7 to 1	Up from 25.6 to 1	29.4 to 1	27.1 to 1
Prime instructional time	89.7%	Up from 88.5%	89.3%	89.4%
Dollars spent per pupil**	\$9,194	Up 11.3%	\$6,955	\$7,708
Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries**	59.3%	Down from 62.4%	60.0%	57.1%
Percent of expenditures for instruction**	60.5%	Down from 63.9%	61.8%	59.6%
Opportunities in the arts	Good	No Change	Excellent	Excellent
SACS accreditation	Yes	No Change	Yes	Yes
Parents attending conferences	100.0%	No Change	98.8%	97.8%
Character development program	Excellent	Up from Average	Good	Good
Modern language program assessment	N/A	N/A	Good	Good
Classical language program assessment	N/A	N/A	Average	Average

\* Includes current year teachers contracted for 185 or more days.

\*\* Prior year audited financial data are reported.

## Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable N/AV–Not Available N/C–Not Collected N/R–Not Reported I/S–Insufficient Sample

## Performance By Student Groups

	HSAP Passage Rate by Spring 2012		End of Course Tests Passage Rate		On-time Graduation Rate, 2012	
	n	%	t	%	n	%
All Students	231	90.5%	1051	74.2%	242	81.0%
<b>Gender</b>						
Male	121	86.0%	541	72.8%	127	73.2%
Female	110	95.5%	510	75.7%	115	89.6%
<b>Racial/Ethnic Group</b>						
White	201	90.0%	898	77.5%	206	83.0%
African American	12	100.0%	59	52.5%	15	73.3%
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	15	93.3%	78	53.8%	18	66.7%
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Disability Status</b>						
Disabled	33	54.5%	139	46.8%	32	34.4%
<b>Migrant Status</b>						
Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>English Proficiency</b>						
Limited English Proficient	N/A	N/A	63	52.4%	N/A	N/A
<b>Socio-Economic Status</b>						
Subsidized meals	93	84.9%	487	64.5%	96	64.6%

NOTE: n=number of students on which percentage is calculated; t=number of tests taken.

## Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable N/AV–Not Available N/C–Not Collected N/R–Not Reported I/S–Insufficient Sample

## Report of Principal and School Improvement Council

Gilbert High School chose the theme "Growing a Green Future" for 2011-2012 as our students continued implementing our recycling program. This summer we continue supporting a green future by breaking ground for our Center for Sustainable Solutions.

Believing that we should provide a 21st century education for our students, Gilbert High School teachers adopted the Gradual Release of Responsibility Learning Model by reading Douglas Fisher and Nancy Frey's "Better Learning Through Structured Teaching." Using this model allows our teachers to gradually release the responsibility of learning from teacher-based instruction to student-driven learning. By taking more responsibility during the learning process, we feel that our students will become more self-directed and, thus, better prepared for life in the 21st century.

Gilbert High School hosted a team of educators for our second High Schools That Work (HSTW) Technical Assistance Visit (TAV). We received commendations on providing challenging career and technical studies, including school-based and work-based learning opportunities, as well as involving parents in a guidance and advisement system. The findings indicated that we need to raise the rigor in our instruction, a challenge and a focus for the 2012-2013 school year.

It was a banner year at Gilbert High School. Our students achieved three state championships: 2A Marching Band; 1A-2A Chorus; and 2A Baseball. We managed to win several region titles and advanced deep in the playoffs in multiple sports. GHS boasted the eighth spot in South Carolina in the SCACA Athletic Director's Cup for 2A. Several student athletes signed with various colleges and universities to continue their athletic career. Our career and technology department continues to participate in state and national competitions including HOSA, FFA, FBLA and SkillsUSA. Fine Arts programs continue to perform at a high level, providing many opportunities for competition and community activities.

Gilbert High School successfully executed a personal mobile computing pilot in spring of 2011. As part of our ongoing search for ways to provide students with the tools they need to support their learning, Lexington One expanded our pilot by providing iPads for all high school students. Our hope is for students to learn the essential skills they will need as consumers, citizens and workers. These devices have provided immediate access to information for our students. Interactive applications have allowed them to improve their creativity, collaboration, critical thinking and communication. All disciplines benefited from these devices and support the Gradual Release of Responsibility Learning Model.

Our efforts were validated by an AdvancED Quality Assurance Review (QAR) team. During the April visit, our district was commended as "highly functional" in six of the seven AdvancED standards with the sixth being operational. Through strong leadership and a supportive board, Gilbert High School continues to pursue innovative 21st century learning opportunities for our students.

Principal Ann O'Cain and SIC Chair Cindy Bostic

## Evaluations by Teachers, Students and Parents

	Teachers	Students*	Parents*
Number of surveys returned	56	164	28
Percent satisfied with learning environment	94.4%	85.4%	85.7%
Percent satisfied with social and physical environment	100.0%	88.8%	84.6%
Percent satisfied with school-home relations	94.6%	89.5%	75.0%

\* Only eleventh grade students and their parents were included. For schools without grade eleven, only the highest grade was included.

### Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable    N/AV–Not Available    N/C–Not Collected    N/R–Not Reported    I/S–Insufficient Sample

**ESEA/Federal Accountability Rating System**

In July 2012, the South Carolina Department of Education was granted a waiver from several accountability requirements of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This waiver allowed SC to replace the former pass/fail system with one that utilizes more of the statewide assessments already in place and combine these subject area results with graduation rate (in high schools) to determine if each school met the target or made progress toward the target. This analysis results in a letter grade for the school rather than the pass/fail system of previous years. For a detailed review of the matrix for each school and districts that determined the letter grade, please use the following link: <http://ed.sc.gov/data/eSEA/> or request this information from your child's district or school.

<b>Overall Weighted Points Total</b>	<b>81.4</b>
<b>Overall Grade Conversion</b>	<b>B</b>

Index Score	Grade	Description
90-100	A	Performance substantially exceeds the state's expectations.
80-89.9	B	Performance exceeds the state's expectations.
70-79.9	C	Performance meets the state's expectations.
60-69.9	D	Performance does not meet the state's expectations.
Less than 60	F	Performance is substantially below the state's expectations

**Accountability Indicator for Title I Schools**

Gilbert High School school has been designated as a:

- Title I Reward School for Performance - among the highest performing Title I schools in a given year.
- Title I Reward School for Progress – one of the schools with substantial progress in student subgroups.
- Title I Focus School – one of the schools with the highest average performance gap between subgroups.
- Title I Priority School – one of the 5% lowest performing Title I schools.
- Title I School – does not qualify as Reward, Focus or Priority School.
- Non-Title I School – therefore the designations above are not applicable.

**Teacher Quality Data**

	<b>Our District</b>	<b>State</b>
Classes in low poverty schools not taught by highly qualified teachers	0.4%	2.6%
Classes in high poverty schools not taught by highly qualified teachers	N/A	5.1%

	<b>Our School</b>	<b>State Objective</b>	<b>Met State Objective</b>
Classes not taught by highly qualified teachers	0.0%	0.0%	Yes

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable    N/AV–Not Available    N/C–Not Collected    N/R–Not Reported    /S–Insufficient Sample

Performance By Group

Subgroups	ELA Mean	Math Mean	Science Mean	Social Studies Mean	ELA % Tested	Math % Tested	Graduation Rate
<b>Grades 9-12</b>							
All Students	233	235	86	73	99.6	99.6	80.6
Male	228	234	87	72	100.0	100.0	78.3
Female	238	237	85	73	99.1	99.1	83.5
White	234	237	87	73	99.5	99.5	82.0
African American	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	60.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	72.7
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Disabled	210	208	N/A	N/A	100.0	100.0	44.4
Limited English Proficient	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Subsidized meals	224	223	81	70	99.1	99.1	69.4
Annual Measurable Objective (AMO)	223	220	76	71	95.0	95	73.1

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable    N/AV–Not Available    N/C–Not Collected    N/R–Not Reported    I/S–Insufficient Sample

**Two-Year HSAP Trend Data**

	School Year	Enrollment 1st Day of Testing	% Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	School % Proficient or Advanced*
<b>English/Language Arts</b>								
All Students	2011	209	99.5	10.7	24.9	28.4	36.0	70.6
	2012	229	99.6	12.8	25.6	33.8	27.9	71.2
<b>Mathematics</b>								
All Students	2011	209	99.5	13.7	30.5	29.4	26.4	65.5
	2012	229	99.6	13.2	24.2	33.8	28.8	71.2

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable    N/AV–Not Available    N/C–Not Collected    N/R–Not Reported    I/S–Insufficient Sample