

Alachua County Public Schools

# Howard W. Bishop Middle School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>28</b>

# 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: 7/1/2010

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>28</b>

## 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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

### 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Gamble, Mike	Principal	
Reddick, Clay	Assistant Principal	
Speer, James	Assistant Principal	
Padgett, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	
Ogle, Shravana	Teacher, K-12	
Yancey, Patricia	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	
Montmarquette, John	Teacher, ESE	



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jennings-Lopez, LaToya	Other	
Brugger, Kathleen	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2010, Jennifer Wise

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

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

42

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (57%)

	2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	214	216	191	0	0	0	0	621	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	48	20	0	0	0	0	102	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	17	13	0	0	0	0	37	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	10	0	0	0	0	28	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	5	0	0	0	0	20	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	49	38	0	0	0	0	132	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	34	33	0	0	0	0	106	

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	32	26	23	0	0	0	0	81	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

Wednesday 9/9/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	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	25	39	0	0	0	0	89

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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	
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	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	25	39	0	0	0	0	89

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

## 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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

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%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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			
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		

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
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%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	80
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	74
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	84
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## 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 afterschool 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?**

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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Increase the achievement of SWD. The SWD subgroup at Bishop severely languished behind their peers in every component of the school grade.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Increase the federal index rating for Students With Disabilities to meet or exceed the ESSA target of 41%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Bishop's strategy is to increase inclusion of SWD into regular education classrooms by removing all but 4 resource classes from the master schedule, while using a Differentiated Instructional Coach to support teachers with inclusion. Support facilitation is now being used in Reading sections instead of Language Arts so that small group instruction can be paired with the differentiation in i-Ready.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	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 Steps to Implement**

1. Develop ESE schedule with district ESE Supervisor

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

2. Meet with ESE department chair to determine co-teach placement of SWDs

**Person Responsible** James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)

3. Assign regular and ESE teachers to PD on co-teaching.

**Person Responsible** James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)

4. Monthly ESE department meetings to discuss progress.

**Person Responsible** James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)

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** LaTorria Mosely (moselylj@gm.sbac.edu)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation****Area of Focus**

Increase the learning gains of the Lowest Quartile in ELA and MA statewide assessments.

**Description and 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.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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.du)

**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. We are also targeting our LQ students with i-Ready Online Instruction in our reading sections. i-Ready measures Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, High frequency Words, Vocabulary, Literature Comprehension and Informational Comprehension.

**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. i-Ready is also a vetted program that was recommended for use in our reading sections by the district TSA for ELA. It was piloted by 20 teachers and hundreds of students at other middle schools the previous school year.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Analyze test scores to see which regular students can be moved up to advanced classes

**Person Responsible**

Clay Reddick (reddicce@gm.sbac.du)

2. Develop a master schedule focused on regular class averages around 20 and advanced class averages around 24.

**Person Responsible**

Clay Reddick (reddicce@gm.sbac.du)

3. Move students who scored at least one level 3 into advanced classes and support them through our Differentiated Instructional Coach

**Person Responsible**

Clay Reddick (reddicce@gm.sbac.du)

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

**Person Responsible** Teresa Cornelison (corneltn@gm.sbac.edu)

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.

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

6. Teacher explicitly plan higher order thinking questions for their lessons daily, with an emphasis on critical thinking/problem solving activities.

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

7. A 6th grade and a 7th grade AVID elective periods will be taught by Ms. McCartney 5th and 6th periods that will be populated with recruited students . Students are recruited using interest surveys, student interviews, parent interviews, and potential in advanced course work. These students will also be placed in Advanced Civics or Advanced World History according to the student's grade level. 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.

**Person Responsible** Kirk Tapley (tapleykb@gm.sbac.edu)

8.The AVID site team will teach an AVID strategy to the entire faculty and follow up with teachers interested in using said strategy in their class.

**Person Responsible** Kirk Tapley (tapleykb@gm.sbac.edu)

9. Laptops will be prioritized in a way for our Reading sections to be able to access i-Ready on a weekly basis.

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

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>Close the achievement gap between white and black students</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>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%.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	<p>Clay Reddick (reddicce@gm.sbac.edu)</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decreasing the class size of our regular academic classes (these classes contain our level 1 and 2 students).</li> <li>Placing level 3's and higher in advanced classes to increase the likelihood they remain a 3 and/or achieve a learning gain.</li> <li>Bishop is in the second year of AVID implementation through a 6th grade AVID elective and a 7th grade AVID elective, which is a school-wide PD on AVID strategies, and AVID tutoring.</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>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 neighborhood students and also placing them in Advanced Math, World History and/or Civics to expose them to advanced curriculum.</p>

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Analyze test scores to see which regular students can be moved up to advanced classes.

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

2. Develop a master schedule focused on regular class averages around 20 and advanced class averages around 24.

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

3. Move students who scored at least one level 3 into advanced classes and support them through our Differentiated Instructional Coach.

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

4. The advanced Science teachers will use curriculum that includes laboratories, projects, and other hands-on activities increasing student interest. Students also work collaboratively to increase engagement.

**Person Responsible** Teresa Cornelison (cornelstm@gm.sbac.edu)

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.

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

6. Teachers explicitly plan higher order thinking questions for their lessons daily, with an emphasis on critical thinking/problem solving activities.

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

7. A 6th grade and a 7th grade AVID elective periods will be taught by Ms. McCartney 5th and 6th periods that will be populated with recruited students. Students are recruited using interest surveys, student interviews, parent interviews, and potential in advanced course work. These students will also be placed in Advanced Civics or Advanced World History according to the student's grade level. 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.

**Person Responsible** Kirk Tapley (tapleykb@gm.sbac.edu)

8. The AVID site team will teach an AVID strategy to the entire faculty and follow up with teachers interested in using said strategy in their class.

**Person Responsible** Kirk Tapley (tapleykb@gm.sbac.edu)

9. Laptops will be prioritized in a way for our Reading sections to be able to access i-Ready on a weekly basis.

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

10. BaSE, the Black Student Empowerment Committee will continue to meet throughout the year as a Professional Learning Committee to improve the culture of Howard Bishop. The Committee will provide lesson study opportunities, professional development training in culturally responsive teaching, follow through with the action plan created from the book club on "White Fragility" and provide teacher resources through google classroom and the BaSE slide to support and empower teachers and students.

**Person Responsible** Shravana Ogle (oglems@gm.sbac.edu)



**#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**

<b>Area of Focus</b>	Reduce exclusionary discipline
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	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.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Bishop's goal is to reduce the OSS rate by 15% to 166 days or less.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refrain from mandatory consequences for infractions.</li> <li>• Teachers will utilize clear expectations in their classrooms.</li> <li>• Teachers will develop engaging lessons to keep students in their classrooms.</li> </ul>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parents/guardians will be contacted about student behavior at school with fidelity.</li> <li>• Utilize a behavior para-professional as a check-in person for at-risk students.</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	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 paraprofessional will be the go-to daily contact for our at-risk students to evaluate how their daily performance.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Develop a discipline committee

**Person Responsible** James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)

2. Committee meets monthly to discuss issues including restorative justice.

**Person Responsible** James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)

3. Counselors and deans trained in restorative justice practices.

**Person Responsible** James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)

4. Suspension numbers reviewed weekly by administration.

**Person Responsible** James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)

5. Teachers will share classroom expectations with each other in their teams during pre-planning, and with students continually throughout the year

**Person Responsible** Mike Gamble (gamblemp@gm.sbac.edu)

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

**Person Responsible** LaTorria Mosely (moselylj@gm.sbac.edu)

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



**Person Responsible** James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)

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** Iris Bailey (baileyid@gm.sbac.edu)

9. Creating a Restart Room - The restart room is a calming space for students to release emotions, reflect, and "reset" their brain when they are engaged in a trauma response- fight, flight, freeze, or flee. When students come, they pick a calming station (mindfulness, sensory, creativity, reflection) to participate in for a set amount of time, and check in with the counselor afterwards about their experience. The goal is to reduce discipline and teach our students positive coping skills that they can use in school and throughout their lives.

**Person Responsible** Claire Nogueroles (noguerolcm@gm.sbac.edu)

**#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>Increase the number of black students in advanced classes</p> <p>Part of the district's equity plan is to increase black students' access to advanced curriculum. 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.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>Bishop plans to increase black student placement in advanced classes by 3%</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	<p>Clay Reddick (reddicce@gm.sbac.edu)</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjust student requests so that they are scheduled in more advanced classes by utilizing previous school year's test scores.</li> <li>• Teachers will offer before and/or after school tutoring to all students who need it.</li> <li>• Variable grouping in advanced classes.</li> <li>• Utilize a Differentiated Instructional Coach to support teachers.</li> <li>• Implement an AVID elective and AVID focused note taking to the faculty.</li> </ul> <p>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</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>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.</p>
<b>Action Steps to Implement</b>	

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.

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

2. Provide teachers, and the teacher on the federal grant, a list of these elevated students to help support them before they get behind.

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

3. District's Differentiated Instructional Coach will visit a faculty meeting and email faculty about providing assistance.

**Person Responsible** LaTorria Mosely (moselylj@gm.sbac.edu)

4. Require parent conferences and interventions before removing a student from an advanced class.

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

5. Teachers purposefully create groups with new students in advanced classes paired with experienced/ model students to increase academic performance.

**Person Responsible** Claire Noguerol (noguerolcm@gm.sbac.edu)

6. 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.

**Person Responsible** LaTorria Mosely (moselylj@gm.sbac.edu)

7. A 6th grade and a 7th grade AVID elective periods will be taught by Ms. McCartney 5th and 6th periods that will be populated with recruited students. Students are recruited using interest surveys, student interviews, parent interviews, and potential in advanced course work. These students will also be placed in Advanced Civics or Advanced World History according to the student's grade level. 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.

**Person Responsible** Kirk Tapley (tapleykb@gm.sbac.edu)

8. BaSE, the Black Student Empowerment Committee will continue to meet throughout the year as a Professional Learning Committee to improve the culture of Howard Bishop. The Committee will provide lesson study opportunities, professional development training in culturally responsive teaching, follow through with the action plan created from the book club on "White Fragility" and provide teacher resources through google classroom and the BaSE slide to support and empower teachers and students.

**Person Responsible** Shravana Ogle (oglems@gm.sbac.edu)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**The 5 areas of Focus listed above encompass all of our identified goals for the School Improvement Plan.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Howard Bishop Middle is a Community school, sometimes called "full-service" or "extended-service." It's a school that combines the rigorous academics of a quality school with a wide range of vital in-house services, supports, and opportunities to promote children's learning and development. The Community school unites the most important influences in children's lives- schools, families, and communities to create a web of support that nurtures their development toward productive adulthood. Howard Bishop has five core partners that assist in the development and success of the community partnership. The five partners are the Department of Health, the University of Florida, Santa Fe College, the School Board of Alachua County, and the Children Home Society. The Department of Health supports health and wellness initiatives by providing services through DOH. Families can receive but are not limited to flu vaccination, dental and vision care, and other medical services. Howard Bishop has two licenses' mental health therapists on campus to provide services for students and families. The University of Florida is partnering with Howard Bishop to develop an in house volunteer and mentorship program that will better serve the staff and students at Howard Bishop. The purpose of this program is to assist with the volunteering process that will allow volunteers to work with programs that are embedded in the Howard Bishop culture. We also want volunteers to build a more consistent relationship with Howard Bishop, potentially leading them to become mentors. This will increase support campus-wide for students and teachers. Santa Fe College has been assisting with mentoring and working with the student leadership council at Howard Bishop. The School Board of Alachua County has provided support with building the Swing school while Howard Bishop is being renovated. Children Home Society is the non-profit that provides the staff who is currently working at Howard Bishop, such as the CPS Director, Parent Coordinator, and Expanded Learning Coordinator. Howard Bishop being a community partnership school allows for students and families to have support, all while building a bridge through community outreach.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00