

Alachua County Public Schools

Howard W. Bishop Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Howard W. Bishop Middle School

1262 NW 31ST DRIVE, Gainesville, FL 32605

<https://www.sbac.edu/bishop>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

In order to support our District's mission, we accept that it is our job to create a caring school that is committed to the success of ALL of our students.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Speer, James	Principal	
Reddick, Clay	Assistant Principal	
Yancey, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Yancey is one of the 8th grade team leaders. She is responsible for helping analyze student progress monitoring data.
Jennings-Lopez, LaToya	Other	
Cornelison, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	
Beres, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Dickey, Laura	Teacher, K-12	
Padgett, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	
Thomas, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
Loftus, Laura	Teacher, K-12	
Murray, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Parinello, Laura	Teacher, K-12	
Thames, Tiffany	Teacher, ESE	
Zukas, Lonnie	Teacher, K-12	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

HBMS involves a variety of stakeholder groups in the development of the SIP each year. The Steering Committee made up of grade level team leaders and core content department chairs as well as the School Advisory Committee contribute to the writing of the SIP each year. Additionally, the Community Partnership School Director, her leadership team and the Partner Cabinet are a part of SIP development.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be monitored monthly in Steering and SAC meetings. Data sources reviewed will include, but not be limited to FAST, District ABC and other district progress monitoring data. Based on the data, we will make adjustments to the implementation plans as needed to ensure we are able to reach our SIP goals.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	74%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	96%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	56	54	183	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	77	48	197	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	20	35	98	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	109	46	204	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	106	66	285	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	83	41	247	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	106	66	285	

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	126	73	336	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	61	58	212	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	8	4	29	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	11	2	97	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	70	37	121	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	90	57	235	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	100	62	237	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	61	58	212
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	8	4	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	11	2	97
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	70	37	121
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	90	57	235
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	100	62	237
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	48	49	49	51	51	50	56		
ELA Learning Gains				47			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			31		
Math Achievement*	48	51	56	51	34	36	52		
Math Learning Gains				53			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39			19		
Science Achievement*	51	46	49	47	51	53	57		
Social Studies Achievement*	53	58	68	65	54	58	58		
Middle School Acceleration	89	75	73	80	40	49	76		
Graduation Rate					45	49			
College and Career Acceleration					61	70			
ELP Progress		48	40		80	76			

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	289
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	469
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	14	Yes	4	4
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	34	Yes	4	
HSP	68			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	85			
FRL	37	Yes	2	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	21	Yes	3	3
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	32	Yes	3	
HSP	65			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	37	Yes	1	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	48			48			51	53	89			
SWD	11			18			10	17			4	
ELL	53			61							2	
AMI												
ASN	89			94			82	92	94		5	
BLK	25			23			18	30	72		5	
HSP	58			62			65	64	90		5	
MUL	53			59			59	50	92		5	
PAC												
WHT	80			80			87	84	93		5	
FRL	29			28			25	37	68		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	51	47	36	51	53	39	47	65	80			
SWD	10	24	33	14	28	26	4	31				
ELL	58	44		70	73							
AMI												
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			
PAC												
WHT	85	63		81	69	33	81	93	92			
FRL	29	37	35	28	41	38	22	43	61			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	56	52	31	52	39	19	57	58	76			
SWD	15	29	18	13	24	20	7	18				
ELL	58	58		67	33							
AMI												
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			
PAC												
WHT	89	72	50	86	60	20	85	88	90			
FRL	30	34	28	25	20	18	25	37	53			

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

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	44%	46%	-2%	47%	-3%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	47%	3%	47%	3%
06	2023 - Spring	43%	47%	-4%	47%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	33%	47%	-14%	54%	-21%
07	2023 - Spring	9%	24%	-15%	48%	-39%
08	2023 - Spring	62%	57%	5%	55%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	50%	44%	6%	44%	6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	52%	34%	50%	36%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	57%	43%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	58%	-5%	66%	-13%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Students with disabilities (SWD) at HBMS scored lowest among all subgroups in ELA and math. This has been a trend for the last 3 years. Contributing factors include, discipline offenses resulting in exclusions from class, attendance, teacher turnover and a lack of ongoing, job-embedded professional learning for co-teaching partner teachers.

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

Data indicate overall declines in ELA and math with the exception of 8th grade ELA which improved by 6%. The areas of greatest concern is math, although the decreases in ELA are also an area that must be addressed. Factors contributing to this include out of school suspensions resulting in lost instructional time, attendance and the need for continued professional learning around using data to inform planning for high quality Tier 1 instruction utilizing core materials with fidelity.

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.

The gap between white and black/African American students is greatest when compared to the state in ELA and Science. The low reading proficiency for our black and African American students is contributing to the lack of proficiency in Science. Factors contributing to this are student attendance and behavior. We continue to need to shore up Tier 1 instruction by ensuring lessons are aligned to the grade level benchmarks and all teachers using core adopted materials. Additionally, we need to improve MTSS systems to support learners who are not making adequate progress.

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

Overall, the 8th grade students showed the most improvement in all areas. The 8th grade team has been the most stable team with a large percentage of veteran teachers. The 8th grade team also had the smallest number of students comparatively, which allowed the team to regularly communicate together about student progress and needs for support. Additionally, there was a lot of alignment in expectations for students on the 8th grade team which contributed to the culture and helped to protect instructional minutes.

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

Based on EWS data, the areas of greatest concern are the number of student earning a Level 1 in either ELA or math as well as the number of students missing 10% or more days of school.

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

- 1) The highest instructional priority for HBMS is improving Tier 1 instruction by ensuring all classes are using explicit learning objectives aligned to the standards as well as success criteria so that teachers know what their students know or are able to do.
- 2) Next, HBMS will use data to drive planning for student instruction. Based on success criteria, progress monitoring and any formative and summative data, teachers will plan for acceleration as well as Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction as needed to meet the needs of all students.
- 3) HBMS will monitor student attendance so they can deploy student support services and the resources available through the Community Partnership School to help improve attendance.
- 4) HBMS will monitor student discipline data as we implement school-wide PBIS with fidelity and

leverage all of the support of the Community Partnership school to reduce exclusionary practices and to protect instructional time for students.

Area of Focus

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

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

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Classroom walkthrough data will indicate that teachers are not making the benchmark-aligned lesson objective explicit for all students. As a result, the students will clearly understand what they are going to know or be able to do as a result of the lesson. Increased metacognitive awareness of their knowledge in core curriculum will result in increased student performance on state assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

CWT data will indicate that students are able to articulate the lesson objective when asked at least 75% of the time. Progress monitoring data will indicate by PM3 that at least 55% of students are proficient in ELA and math.

Monitoring:

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

The school leadership team will review CWD bi-weekly to monitor fidelity of the instructional practice of explicit lesson objective. They will additionally provide frequent feedback for growth around this practice, provide time for teachers to share high-impact strategies at monthly professional learning. The Steering Committee will also discuss this at their meetings to monitor implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

All core materials used are selected only if they are Tier 3 or higher in the Evidence for ESSA website. The effect size for the instructional strategies that will be prioritized for implementation and teacher feedback include Learning goals at .68 and Explicit teaching at .57

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All strategies selected were well above the average effect size of .40. Additionally, the focus on implementing core adopted materials with fidelity ensures students are being presented with curriculum that is aligned to the benchmarks and at the rigor of their grade.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will receive feedback around the explicit communication of the lesson objective through both formal observations and classroom walkthroughs.

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

By When: All members of the administrative team will give feedback to teachers about clear lesson objectives monthly, beginning in August, 2023 and continuing throughout the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

All classes will implement the use of success criteria to engage in continuous formative and summative assessment to inform planning and instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Data from classroom walkthroughs will indicate teachers using success criteria 75% of the time. Progress monitoring data will indicate at least 55% of students are proficient on State Assessments.

Monitoring:

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

The systematic use of success criteria will be measured by formal observations and classroom walkthroughs. All teachers will receive feedback at least once a month. The practice of implementing success criteria daily and using the information from this implementation will be an agenda item at monthly Professional Learning Faculty Meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Clay Reddick (reddicce@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

All core materials used are selected only if they are Tier 3 or higher in the Evidence for ESSA website. The effect size for using success criteria is .88, more than double the mean of .40 which would be considered average.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All strategies selected were well above the average effect size of .40. Additionally, the focus on implementing core adopted materials with fidelity ensures students are being presented with curriculum that is aligned to the benchmarks and at the rigor of their grade.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

One of our primary goals this year will be to develop and sustain caring relationships with all students. African American, SWD, SFRL students were all identified in our lower performing groups of students. Student achievement scores and attendance were impacted by an increase in discipline incidents.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to reduce the number of students with less than 90% attendance by 15%. Our student enrollment has increased by 126 students.

Monitoring:

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

School staff will be responsible for monitoring attendance weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Speer (speerjh@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students with poor attendance cannot demonstrate evidence of learning. Growth and achievement cannot be realized when truancy is an issue.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Attendance reports will be run weekly and students who have 10 or more unexcused absences are subjected to the attendance and truancy process that includes multiple educational planning team meetings and development of a truancy petition.

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

By When: By the end of each quarter or 9 weeks.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

School administrators will work with district based staff to determine how the area of focus and relative action plans are aligned to the needs of students. Resource guidance will be decided by data from all sub groups of students. Progress monitoring data helps in determining the frequency and intensity of resources along with the alignment of actionable plans.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No