

Alachua County Public Schools

Howard W. Bishop Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

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

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* 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 12/6/2022.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	96%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 12/6/2022.

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gamble, Mike	Principal	
Reddick, Clay	Assistant Principal	Curriculum, Scheduling, Testing
Speer, James	Assistant Principal	Student Services & ESE
Bailey, John	Teacher, Career/Technical	Team Leader
Padgett, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Mudra, Christopher	Teacher, Career/Technical	Team Leader
Yancey, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Nipper, Lizzie	Teacher, K-12	Math Dept Chair
Dickey, Laura	Teacher, K-12	ELA Dept Chair
Beres, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Electives Dept Chair
Cornelison, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	Science Dept Chair
Ogle, Shravana	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Dept Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2010, Jennifer Wise

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

831

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

3

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

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	306	298	227	0	0	0	0	831	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	61	58	0	0	0	0	212	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	8	4	0	0	0	0	29	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	11	2	0	0	0	0	97	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	70	37	0	0	0	0	121	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	90	57	0	0	0	0	235	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	100	62	0	0	0	0	237	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	109	64	0	0	0	0	287	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	2	0	0	0	0	14	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/28/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	280	224	200	0	0	0	0	704
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	31	42	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	8	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	37	44	0	0	0	0	120
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	42	57	0	0	0	0	152
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	42	41	0	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	42	32	0	0	0	0	121
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	42	41	0	0	0	0	128

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	64	65	69	0	0	0	0	198

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	6	0	0	0	0	20

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	280	224	200	0	0	0	0	704
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	31	42	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	8	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	37	44	0	0	0	0	120
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	42	57	0	0	0	0	152
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	42	41	0	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	42	32	0	0	0	0	121
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	42	41	0	0	0	0	128

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	64	65	69	0	0	0	0	198

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	6	0	0	0	0	20

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	51%	51%	50%				59%	59%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	50%	48%				54%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	34%	38%				30%	41%	47%
Math Achievement	51%	51%	54%				60%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	53%	55%	58%				54%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	42%	55%				37%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	45%	49%				55%	53%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	65%	62%	71%				69%	73%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	56%	53%	3%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	52%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
08	2022					
	2019	60%	61%	-1%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	55%	52%	3%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	57%	59%	-2%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2022					
	2019	6%	27%	-21%	46%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	48%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	66%	69%	-3%	71%	-5%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	94%	56%	38%	61%	33%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	48%	52%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	10	24	33	14	28	26	4	31			
ELL	58	44		70	73						
ASN	94	70		91	69			100			
BLK	23	34	37	23	37	38	15	40	39		
HSP	57	54	20	69	78		57	83	100		
MUL	53	45		53	50	30	64	61	86		
WHT	85	63		81	69	33	81	93	92		
FRL	29	37	35	28	41	38	22	43	61		
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	15	29	18	13	24	20	7	18			
ELL	58	58		67	33						
ASN	93	70		93	70		83		100		
BLK	27	36	29	24	24	19	25	35	56		
HSP	67	57		54	30		75	50	53		
MUL	66	61		67	44		71	77	75		
WHT	89	72	50	86	60	20	85	88	90		
FRL	30	34	28	25	20	18	25	37	53		
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	469
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	85
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	32
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	65
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	55
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	75
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Last year's FSA showed a decline in FSA scores from the 2018-2019 school year in 7 of the 9 categories. The only areas that improved were Learning Gains for the Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math.

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

The percentage of students at or above grade level for ELA, Math, Science and Civics.
Learning gains for all in ELA and Math.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The pandemic. Being in school with all students for the first time since students were sent home in March 2020.

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

Learning gains for the Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math.

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

Smaller class sizes.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Improve attendance and ensuring certified teachers are in place. Frequent feedback to teachers from administrators.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Monthly professional development faculty meetings.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Support for beginning teachers through Beginning Teacher Coaches and Beginning Teacher Cohort meetings.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one
identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Increase the average achievement for Black students in all State assessments (FAST ELA & Math, Civics, Science) to 45% for the 2022-2023 school year. Our previous best was 42% in the 2018-2019 school year, before falling off the past two years.

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

Increase the average achievement for Black students in all State assessments (FAST ELA & Math, Civics, Science) to 45% for the 2022-2023 school year. Our previous best was 42% in the 2018-2019 school year, before falling off the past two years.

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

Monitor FAST and AIMS results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Clay Reddick (reddicce@gm.sbac.edu)

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

Monitor FAST and AIMS results.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

HBMS has a large Black student population who have traditionally scored below grade level in State assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Monitor FAST and AIMS results for progress with Black students. Keep this a focus with classroom Snapshots and Observations.

Person Responsible

Mike Gamble (gamblemp@gm.sbac.edu)

Monitor FAST and AIMS results for progress with Black students. Keep this a focus with classroom Snapshots and Observations.

Person Responsible

Clay Reddick (reddicce@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Exclusionary discipline**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Reduce the number of students who receive at least one day of out-of-school suspension to 10% or less of the total student body for the 2022-2023 school year. Last year a total of 106 out of 705 students received at least one day of OSS, which was 15%. Since our population grew to 832 students this year, success in meeting this goal would mean that no more than 83 students receive a day or more of OSS.

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

Reduce the number of students who receive at least one day of out-of-school suspension to 10% or less of the total student body for the 2022-2023 school year. Last year a total of 106 out of 705 students received at least one day of OSS, which was 15%. Since our population grew to 832 students this year, success in meeting this goal would mean that no more than 83 students receive a day or more of OSS.

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

Bi-weekly Student Services meetings. Monthly monitoring of Skyward discipline and suspension data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)

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

Monitoring of Skyward discipline and suspension data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

If students are not in class, they are not learning. Increase student attendance and engagement by reducing exclusionary discipline.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Monitor attendance data. Discuss strategies and successes at Student Services meetings.

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

Monitor attendance data. Discuss strategies and successes at Student Services meetings.

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

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Improved student attendance**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Reduce the number of students who have less than 90% attendance to 15% for the 2022-2023 school year. Last year that number was 166 of 705 (24%) students had less than 90% attendance. So our target number for success will be that 124 or fewer students have less than 90% attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Reduce the number of students who have less than 90% attendance to 15% for the 2022-2023 school year. Last year that number was 166 of 705 (24%) students had less than 90% attendance. So our target number for success will be that 124 or fewer students have less than 90% attendance.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly monitoring of attendance data by administration and Family Liaison coordinator.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)

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

Reduce the number of students who have less than 90% attendance to 15% for the 2022-2023 school year. Last year that number was 166 of 705 (24%) students had less than 90% attendance. So our target number for success will be that 124 or fewer students have less than 90% attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Students who aren't in school are not learning. Need to improve student attendance and participation.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Bi-weekly reviews of attendance data.

Person Responsible

James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)

Bi-weekly reviews of attendance data.

Person Responsible

James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)

Positive Culture & Environment

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The mission of Howard Bishop Middle School is to educate all students to achieve their highest levels of academic and technical abilities while fostering positive growth in social/emotional behavior. HBMS is a Community Partnership School. As such, we work to unite the most important influences in a child's life - school, family, and community, to create a network that supports their development towards student success. HMBS has five core partners that assist in the development and success of the programs at the school. The four partners are the University of Florida, Santa Fe College, Alachua County Public Schools, Alachua County Health Department and the Children's Home Society. The CPS gives campus-wide support for students and staff through mental health counseling, wellness, and Extended Day services. With the CPS, HBMS has a licensed mental health therapist on campus to provide services to students and families. Students and families can also receive flu vaccinations, TDaP vaccinations, dental and vision care.

This year the CPS Director, LaToya Jennings-Lopez, initiated a "Silent Transition" between classes, in which students move without talking or making noise between classes. It has been used sparingly, but it does work.

Emphasis on adult presence in hallways and around the school during class changes and lunch.

This year we have reinvigorated our PBIS program with weekly drawings for prizes using Soar Bucks. Grade-level academic teams all choose Students of the Week, with phone calls home to families of Students of the Week each Monday.

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

Student Services team - administration, deans, counselors, SRO, Behavior Para