Howard W. Bishop Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Howard W. Bishop Middle School

1262 NW 31ST DRIVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

https://www.sbac.edu/bishop

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Wise

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2010

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click here</u>.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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

Howard W. Bishop Middle School

1262 NW 31ST DRIVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

https://www.sbac.edu/bishop

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	80%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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.

The mission of Howard Bishop Middle School is to educate all students to achieve their highest level of academic and technical performance, while fostering positive growth in social/emotional behaviors.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In order to support our District's mission statement that "We are committed to the success of every student" we accept that it is our job to overcome obstacles and do all we can to ensure our students are prepared to move to the next level. We are creating a caring school that is committed to the success of ALL of our students.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gamble, Mike	Principal	The school's leadership team meets weekly on Mondays after school. The school's leadership team is comprised of the Principal, both Assistant Principals, six team leaders (two from each grade level), department chairs, and teacher leaders. Leadership team members share progress data with their teams and departments. The leadership team is chaired by the Principal who is responsible for implementing, supporting and evaluating data and ensuring processes are working in conjunction with the goals of the school improvement plan. Information is shared with the leadership team, who are then responsible for sharing the information with all members of their teams (all teachers are assigned to a team). Oftentimes team leaders are asked to discuss school wide initiatives/concerns and bring feedback from their teams to the leadership meeting. Thus, all members of the school community have an opportunity to participate in the process.
Reddick, Clay	Assistant Principal	
Speer, James	Assistant Principal	
Padgett, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	
Ogle, Shravana	Teacher, K-12	
Yancey, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	
Jost, Paul	Teacher, K-12	
Cornelison, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	
Beres, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Colson, Diane	Instructional Media	
Mudra, Christopher	Teacher, K-12	
Tapley, Kirk	Teacher, K-12	
Noguerol, Claire	School Counselor	
Thomas, Rachel	Teacher, ESE	
Carr, Raymond	Teacher, K-12	
Bailey, Iris	Dean	

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Montmarquette, John	Teacher, ESE	
Jennings-Lopez, LaToya	Other	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	240	212	215	0	0	0	0	667
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	13	8	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	12	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	16	26	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	54	77	0	0	0	0	195

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	25	39	0	0	0	0	89

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	3	0	0	0	0	11

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

45

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/3/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	35	46	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	23	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	20	18	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	59	96	0	0	0	0	219

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	25	28	45	0	0	0	0	98

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	59%	54%	55%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	56%	54%	56%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	41%	47%	29%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	60%	60%	58%	54%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	54%	56%	57%	53%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	46%	51%	36%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	55%	53%	51%	52%	57%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	69%	73%	72%	72%	72%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	240 (0)	212 (0)	215 (0)	667 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	13 ()	13 ()	8 ()	34 (0)
One or more suspensions	11 (0)	15 (0)	12 (0)	38 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	16 (0)	16 (0)	26 (0)	58 (0)

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey			
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	64 (0)	54 (0)	77 (0)	195 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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**
06	2019	56%	53%	3%	54%	2%
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	54%	54%	0%	52%	2%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	51%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	60%	61%	-1%	56%	4%
	2018	62%	61%	1%	58%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	55%	52%	3%	55%	0%
	2018	53%	53%	0%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	57%	59%	-2%	54%	3%
	2018	51%	58%	-7%	54%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	6%	27%	-21%	46%	-40%
	2018	13%	24%	-11%	45%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	53%	54%	-1%	48%	5%
	2018	55%	53%	2%	50%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	69%	-3%	71%	-5%
2018	66%	69%	-3%	71%	-5%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	56%	38%	61%	33%
2018	91%	60%	31%	62%	29%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	48%	52%	57%	43%
2018	100%	63%	37%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

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	15	26	20	15	30	33	21	17			

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
ASN	97	66		97	65			100	96		
BLK	31	38	29	34	39	36	27	46	80		
HSP	89	67		82	61			87	93		
MUL	80	70		72	58		70		95		
WHT	85	72		87	73		90	88	94		
FRL	37	41	29	34	40	36	28	47	83		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	42	44	15	43	34	4	21			
ASN	97	74		97	84		94		93		
BLK	30	47	42	26	43	36	23	44	67		
HSP	79	63		76	71		86	80	95		
MUL	84	70		82	74		69	83	70		
WHT	86	70	73	88	84	61	87	94	87		
FRL	36	49	45	33	50	38	28	46	78		

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	10	27	19	11	40	37	19	19			
ASN	97	85		97	79		100	100	94		
BLK	25	37	28	23	34	32	21	45	57		
HSP	77	72		77	69			100	91		
MUL	75	70		75	69		65	94	94		
WHT	90	77		90	75	43	90	94	89		
FRL	28	40	30	26	36	34	31	51	51		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	509
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	80
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	74
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	84
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Bishop's lowest school grade component was "ELA Lowest 25th percent Learning Gains" at 30%. The year before, the same component was at 44%. During the 2017 and 2018 testing periods that component was 29% and 38% respectively. An examination of the data shows it decreasing 7%, then increasing 15%, then decreasing again 14%. Upon reflection, we think the biggest contributing factor was the lack of targeted after school instruction. During the 2017-18 school year, our Community Partnership provided after-school activities that included IXL in Reading and Math that target our Lowest Quartile students and our 2.5 bucket students. During the 2018-19 school year, the after-school program floundered with low participation and lack of quality instruction. We believe the trend shows an increase this school year. However, we want to change the pattern of decreases in alternate years. We believe a consistent and high quality after-school program will help along with other related strategies.

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

Bishop's component of greatest decline from the previous year was "ELA Lowest 25th Percentile Learning Gains" at -14%. Upon reflection, we think the biggest contributing factor was the lack of targeted after-school instruction. During the 2017-18 school year, our Community Partnership provided after-school activities that included IXL in Reading and Math that target our Lowest Quartile students and our 2.5 bucket students. During the 2018-19 school year the after-school program floundered with low participation and a lack of quality instruction. We believe the trend shows an increase this school year. However, we want to change the pattern of decreases in alternate years. We believe a consistent and high quality after-school program will help along with other related strategies.

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.

Bishop's lowest school grade component was "ELA Lowest 25th percent Learning Gains" at 30%. The year before, the same component was at 44%. During the 2017 and 2018 testing periods that component was 29% and 38% respectively. An examination of the data shows it decreasing 7%, then increasing 15%, then decreasing again 14%. Upon reflection, we think the biggest contributing factor was the lack of targeted after school instruction. During the 2017-18 school year, our Community Partnership provided after-school activities that included IXL in Reading and Math that target our Lowest Quartile students and our 2.5 bucket students. During the 2018-19 school year, the after-school program floundered with low participation and lack of quality instruction. We believe the trend shows an increase this school year. However, we want to change the pattern of decreases in alternate years. We believe a consistent and high quality after-school program will help along with other related strategies.

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

Bishop's component that showed the most improvement was "Acceleration Success." Last year the non-Academy Advanced Math sections were eliminated, and those students were placed in the Academy Advanced Math sections, including Algebra 1 Honors. Although the students that came from regular 7th grade Math struggled, we kept them in those classes and assisted them by providing study halls during the day and targeted tutoring when able. In addition, every student who scored a 3 or higher on the 7th grade FSA Math test was placed in an Algebra 1 Honors section.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The Bishop Educational Planning Team examines the EWS indicators along with retention data, attendance and discipline data, to implement academic interventions as part of the RTI process. EPT meetings are scheduled with parents/guardians of students identified by the reading and core teachers to determine which students will receive intensive, Tier 2/3 interventions. Additionally, social/emotional factors which may affect students are analyzed and affected students are referred for services and support both in and out of school. This includes but is not limited to, enrolling in the after-school program, referring for mental health counseling with the Community Partnership/CHS services, and/or referrals to contracted behavioral and mental health agencies in our community. Currently 29.2% of our students possess this EWS indicator.

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

1. Raising LQ Learning gains in ELA and MA
2. Close the achievement gap between white and black students
3. Decrease disproportionate discipline
4. Increase test scores of SWD
5. Increase number of black students in advanced classes.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase the learning gains of the Lowest Quartile in ELA and MA statewide assessments.
Rationale	In order to decrease the achievement gap, our lowest students need to progress towards proficiency. It is not realistic to expect every level 1 and 2 student to become proficient this school year, however it is a powerful goal to believe every student can make a gain.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to increase LQ learning gains in both ELA and MA. In ELA, our goal is to achieve 45% LQ learning gains. In MA, our goal is to achieve 42% LQ learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Clay Reddick (reddicce@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Targeting our LQ students for enrollment into our after school program where they will use IXL for targeted instruction in ELA and MA. Our grade level teachers use RTI/MTSS to target strategies to help fill in gaps in student knowledge and abilities. A Differentiated Instructional Coach will be utilized to support our grade level teachers increase the achievement of LQ students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	IXL is a vetted program that was recommended for after school program use by the district TSAs for ELA and MA. This strategy was in use when LQ learning gains was at its highest level at Bishop over the last four years. RTI/MTSS is research-based to identify student needs, and used Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies to target improvement.

Action Step	
Description	1. Analyze test scores to see which regular students can be moved up to advanced classes. 2. Develop a master schedule focused on regular class averages around 20 and advanced class averages around 24. 3. Move students who scored at least one level 3 into advanced classes and support them through our Differentiated Instructional Coach. 4. The advanced Science teachers will use curriculum that includes laboratories, projects, and other hand on activities increasing student interest. Students also work collaboratively to increase engagement. 5. Teachers consciously push students toward high quality work with high expectations. This includes exposing students below grade level in Rd/MA to grade-level work. 6. Teacher explicitly plan higher order thinking questions for their lessons daily, with an emphasis on critical thinking/problem solving activities. 7. An AVID elective period will be taught by Mr. Freeman 6th period that will be populated with 6th grade ELA 2.5 students. These students will also be placed in Mr. Tapley's Advanced World History class. Students will be taught note-taking, study skills, and critical thinking skills along with tutoring twice a week. The emphasis will be that each of these students are expected to go to college. 8. LaTorria Mosely, the district AVID coordinator, will lead bi-weekly focused note-taking professional development for teachers after school. Teachers will apply the strategies in their classrooms. 9. The AVID site team will teach a note taking strategy to the entire faculty. Each month,

teachers will bring in student work samples to share and discuss the effectivity of the strategy.

Person Responsible LaToya Jennings-Lopez (jenninlt@gm.sbac.edu)

#2	
Title	Close the achievement gap between white and black students
Rationale	Alachua County has the largest achievement gap between white and black students in the state. In order to reduce the gap, we have to purposefully use an equity lens when making school decisions.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome for Bishop is to continue to decrease the achievement gap in ELA and MA. Our goal is to lower the gap in ELA 3% points to 51% and to lower the gap in MA 3% points to 52%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Clay Reddick (reddicce@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	• Decreasing the class size of our regular academic classes (these classes contain our level 1 and 2 students). • Placing level 3's and higher in advanced classes to increase the likelihood they remain a 3 and/or achieve a learning gain. • Bishop is in the first year of AVID implementation through a 6th grade AVID elective, which is a school-wide PD on focused note taking, and AVID tutoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In order for students to make learning gains and reach proficiently they need to be in class. By decreasing the class size, we can improve classroom behavior and student time on task. Students who are not challenged may regress in testing the next year. We schedule all our level 3's into at least one advanced class. The AVID elective is targeting our 6th grade ELA 2.5 students and also placing them in advanced World History to expose them to advanced curriculum.

Action Step	
Description	1. Analyze test scores to see which regular students can be moved up to advanced classes. 2. Develop a master schedule focused on regular class averages around 20 and advanced class averages around 24. 3. Move students who scored at least one level 3 into advanced classes and support them through our Differentiated Instructional Coach. 4. The advanced Science teachers will use curriculum that includes laboratories, projects, and other hand on activities increasing student interest. Students also work collaboratively to increase engagement. 5. Teachers consciously push students toward high quality work with high expectations. This includes exposing students below grade level in Rd/MA to grade-level work. 6. Teacher explicitly plan higher order thinking questions for their lessons daily, with an emphasis on critical thinking/problem solving activities. 7. An AVID elective period will be taught by Mr. Freeman 6th period that will be populated with 6th grade ELA 2.5 students. These students will also be placed in Mr. Tapley's Advanced World History class. Students will be taught note-taking, study skills, and critical thinking skills along with tutoring twice a week. The emphasis will be that each of these students are expected to go to college. 8. LaTorria Mosely, the district AVID coordinator, will lead bi-weekly focused note-taking professional development for teachers after school. Teachers will apply the strategies in their classrooms.

9. The AVID site team will teach a note taking strategy to the entire faculty. Each month, teachers will bring in student work samples to share and discuss the effectivity of the strategy.

Person Responsible   Clay Reddick (reddicce@gm.sbac.edu)

#3	
Title	Reduce exclusionary discipline
Rationale	Students will not learn if they are not engaged in class. The more time spent on task in a classroom the more our students will improve.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Bishop's goal is to reduce the OSS rate by 15% to 63 days or less.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	• Refrain from mandatory consequences for infractions. • Teachers will utilize clear expectations in their classrooms. • Teachers will develop engaging lessons to keep students in their classrooms. • Parents/guardians will be contacted about student behavior at school with fidelity. • Utilize a behavior para-professional as a check-in person for at-risk students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Anytime mandatory consequences/sentencing is used, a disproportionate number of black students are affected. In order to change inappropriate behavior without the use of exclusionary discipline, the school will increase the use of restorative justice practices in lieu of suspension. If students are engaged in their work, they are less likely to act out and receive disciplinary consequences. Teachers and administrators will utilize whichever contact method works best for each student's parents/guardians. The behavior para-professional will be the go-to daily contact for our at-risk students to evaluate how their daily performance.

Action Step	
Description	1. Develop a discipline committee. 2. Committee meets monthly to discuss issues including restorative justice. 3. Counselors and deans trained in restorative justice practices. 4. Suspension numbers reviewed weekly by administration. 5. Teachers will share classroom expectations with each other in their teams during pre-planning, and with students continually throughout the year. 6. Teachers work with each other and our Differentiated Instructional Coach to develop engaging lessons, which will lessen opportunities for students to engage in disruptive behavior. 7. Teachers and administration will use whichever method is best (phone, email, text, Instagram, Twitter, Remind) to contact the parent/guardian of a student about behavior. 8. The behavior para-professional will be given a list of students (which will be adjusted as needed) to check in with. During these check-ins, the positives and negatives of the student's behavior for that day will be discussed along with techniques to use to improve behavior.
Person Responsible	Clay Reddick (reddicce@gm.sbac.edu)

#4	
Title	Increase the achievement of SWD
Rationale	The SWD subgroup at Bishop severely languished behind their peers in every component of the school grade.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Bishop's goal is to increase the learning gains in ELA 17 points to 43% and in MA 14 points to 44%..
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Audrey Spiers (spiersaj@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Bishop's strategy is to increase inclusion of SWD into regular education classrooms by removing all but two resource classes from the master schedule, while using a Differentiated Instructional Coach to support teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research shows inclusion increases the achievement of SWD. This also allows the school to offer more co-teach classes. We will have our co-teachers and regular education teachers trained by district staff to increase effective teaching in the classrooms. The Differentiated Instructional Coach will be able to give individual targeted support to all our teachers who teach SWD.

Action Step	
Description	1. Develop ESE schedule with district ESE Supervisor. 2. Meet with ESE department chair to determine co-teach placement of SWDs. 3. Assign regular and ESE teachers to PD on co-teaching. 4. Monthly ESE department meetings to discuss progress. 5. LaTorria Mosely is our Differentiated Instructional Coach. She is assisting our teachers with classroom management, standards-based instruction, increasing rigor, differentiating the curriculum based on abilities, interests, and exceptionalities, formative assessments, data-driven instruction, increasing engagement and collaborative structures.
Person Responsible	Audrey Spiers (spiersaj@gm.sbac.edu)

#5	
Title	Increase the number of black students in advanced classes
Rationale	Part of the district's equity plan is to increase black students' access to advanced curriculium. Bishop works towards this goal by placing students who scored a 3 or higher on their ELA or MA state test into advanced classes with our magnet students.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Bishop plans to increase black student placement in advanced classes by 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Clay Reddick (reddicce@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	• Adjust student requests so that they are scheduled in more advanced classes by utilizing previous school year's test scores. • Teachers will offer before and/or after school tutoring to all students who need it. • Variable grouping in advanced classes. • Utilize a Differentiated Instructional Coach to support teachers. • Implement an AVID elective and AVID focused note taking to the faculty.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In order improve student achievement, expectations need to be raised. By exposing students to advanced curriculum and supporting their transition to that type of classroom, more black students will be ready for advanced curriculum in high school. A federal grant will be utilized which will provide a period for a teacher to support these students. We will also reach out to the District's Differentiated Instructional Coach to help our teachers adjust to these new students. Students who are new to advanced curriculum may struggle with the increased rigor and work demand. Before and/or after school tutoring can be used to help fill in the gaps as students adjust to their new expectations. Variable grouping is used in our advanced classes to strategically place students with role model peers to increase academic performance. Differentiation will be provided to help all learners.

Action Step	
Description	1. Check test scores over the summer and change student placement when appropriate. If a student was elevated into advanced classes, the year before they automatically remain in advanced classes unless their score dropped to a 1 and had poor grades. The only exception is Algebra 1 Honors, since it is a high school course for high school credit. 2. Provide teachers, and the teacher on the federal grant, a list of these elevated students to help support them before they get behind. 3. District's Differentiated Instructional Coach will visit a faculty meeting and email faculty about providing assistance. 4. Require parent conferences and interventions before removing a student from an advanced class. 5. Teachers will send their tutoring hours to Mr. Reddick, who will then compile them into a Google Doc shared with everyone. 6. Teachers purposefully create groups with new students in advanced classes paired with experienced/model students to increase academic performance. 7. LaTorria Mosely is our Differentiated Instructional Coach. She will be helping our advanced teachers with classroom management, standards-based instruction, increasing rigor, differentiating the curriculum based on abilities, interests, and exceptionalities,

formative assessments, data-driven instruction, increasing engagement and collaborative structures.

8. An AVID elective period will be taught by Mr. Freeman 6th period that will be populated with 6th grade ELA 2.5 students. These students will also be placed in Mr. Tapley's Advanced World History class. Students will be taught note-taking, study skills, and critical thinking skills along with tutoring twice a week. The emphasis will be that each of these students are expected to go to college.

9. LaTorria Mosely, the district AVID coordinator, will lead bi-weekly focused note-taking professional development for teachers after school. Teachers will apply the strategies in their classrooms.

10. The AVID site team will teach a note taking strategy to the entire faculty. Each month, teachers will bring in student work samples to share and discuss the effectivity of the strategy.

| **Person Responsible** | Clay Reddick (reddicce@gm.sbac.du) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase the learning gains of the Lowest Quartile in ELA and MA statewide assessments.	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Close the achievement gap between white and black students	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reduce exclusionary discipline	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase the achievement of SWD	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase the number of black students in advanced classes	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00