

Polk County Public Schools

# Bartow Senior High School



## 2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>8</b>

## Bartow Senior High School

1270 BROADWAY AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

<http://www.bartowhighschool.com/>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	60%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

### School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	C	C	B*

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Polk County School Board on 1/15/2019.

### 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.

Bartow High School is a cohesive and diverse learning community, promoting a global perspective. The three schools (Bartow High School, IB at Bartow High, and Summerlin Academy) are dedicated to providing distinct pathways of rigorous academic and social excellence encouraging students to achieve their greatest potential. Graduates will become contributing, successful, and influential citizens with a passion for lifelong learning.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Bartow High School will become an "A" school, graduating 100% of our students.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title
Clemons, Emilean	Principal
Craven, Mandy	Assistant Principal
Cochran, Steven	Principal
Austin, Angie	Assistant Principal
Hardman, Brenda	Principal
Brown, Teddy	Assistant Principal
Jones, Sharon	Dean
Stinson, Debra	Dean
Webster, Brian	Dean
Crowley, Kelly	Instructional Coach
Lawson, Lance	Assistant Principal

#### Duties

#### Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The Bartow High School leadership team ensures that the school's vision, purpose, and goals guide the teaching and learning process by maintaining a focus on academic rigor and relevance. The BHS/IB/SA administration meets weekly with the Distributive Leadership Team and Academic Leadership Team, which consists of administrators, deans, instructional support staff, and teachers to review student data. The leadership teams analyze student achievement results to make data driven decisions regarding curriculum and instruction. Additionally, a distributive leadership plan has been created and implemented, assigning administrators to specific content areas and academies. This has supported the monitoring of standards based instruction throughout the school.

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

#### Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The data group that showed the lowest is learning gains for ELA among the lower 25%. Although we made gains in this category in the 16-17 school year, Bartow High regressed for the 17-18 school year.

#### Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

US History declined by three points.

#### Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The biggest Gap is in our Science component. Bartow is below the state average by 16 points.

#### Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Math Gains in the lower 25% shows the greatest improvement. Bartow High increased by 10 points on this component. Bartow High increased by 4 points in the 16-17 school year as well. This indicates an increase over the past two years.

#### Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

The actions that led to this improvement include an appropriate course progression that allows teachers to better prepare students who affect the cells.

### 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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	45%	46%	56%	43%	44%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	47%	53%	40%	45%	46%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	39%	44%	24%	37%	38%
Math Achievement	42%	44%	51%	31%	32%	43%
Math Learning Gains	46%	42%	48%	31%	31%	39%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	38%	45%	27%	35%	38%
Science Achievement	51%	65%	67%	53%	54%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	57%	63%	71%	57%	64%	69%

#### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	167 (0)	170 (0)	180 (0)	195 (0)	712 (0)
One or more suspensions	94 (0)	69 (0)	44 (0)	42 (0)	249 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	190 (0)	246 (0)	149 (0)	73 (0)	658 (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
09	2018	47%	43%	4%	53%	-6%
	2017	47%	43%	4%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2018	46%	42%	4%	53%	-7%
	2017	43%	40%	3%	50%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	50%	59%	-9%	65%	-15%
2017	52%	51%	1%	63%	-11%
Compare		-2%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	56%	57%	-1%	68%	-12%
2017	59%	56%	3%	67%	-8%
Compare		-3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	43%	60%	-17%	62%	-19%
2017	26%	43%	-17%	60%	-34%
Compare		17%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	39%	41%	-2%	56%	-17%
2017	31%	34%	-3%	53%	-22%
Compare		8%			

## Subgroup Data

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	9	35	30	26	39	37	23	36		67	10
ELL	10	32	28	21	32	25	17	18		82	29
AMI	30	60									
ASN	86	77		92	55		89	94		100	92
BLK	28	34	27	33	47	50	28	38		80	33
HSP	37	40	36	33	40	37	43	54		89	48
MUL	65	57		58	47		53	54			
WHT	54	49	28	49	49	41	62	60		89	52
FRL	33	39	31	33	42	45	39	45		84	40
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	8	20	20	12	31	39	9	28		63	13
ELL	7	20	17	8	29	40	8	12		71	20
AMI	45	55		45	50						
ASN	92	83		81	87		83	100		96	95
BLK	27	34	29	20	29	29	33	49		76	30
HSP	37	34	25	31	34	29	47	55		80	39
MUL	66	59		54	55		67	70		86	67
WHT	52	47	38	42	40	35	58	61		84	52
FRL	30	33	29	23	34	37	39	49		74	32

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

## Areas of Focus:

### Activity #1

<b>Title</b>	Student Achievement in school grade components will increase by 3% on 2018-2019 Spring Assessments.
<b>Rationale</b>	Lack of depth of knowledge and intent of FSA standards and assessments.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	Provide resources and support for instructional staff focusing on rigorous instruction, depth of state standards, and student autonomy.
<b>Point Person</b>	Emilean Clemons (emilean.clemons@polk-fl.net)

### Action Step

<b>Description</b>	Provide resources and support to ensure that weekly collaborative planning focuses on the continuous incorporation of LSI target-task, best practices, and collaborative structures (taxonomy, student autonomy).
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Emilean Clemons (emilean.clemons@polk-fl.net)

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

<b>Description</b>	Administrators rotate through content area collaborative planning sessions regularly and will monitor instruction to ensure target-task alignment.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Emilean Clemons (emilean.clemons@polk-fl.net)

### Activity #2

<b>Title</b>	BHS/IB/SA will increase the College & Career Acceleration component to 58% for the 2018-19 cohort.
<b>Rationale</b>	Need to focus on college and career readiness, as well as acceleration, to increase the number of students meeting criteria/requirements.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	Provide appropriate scheduling to increase the number of students enrolled in dual enrollment, AP, IB and industry certification courses and/or exams.
<b>Point Person</b>	Mandy Craven (mandy.craven@polk-fl.net)

### Action Step

<b>Description</b>	Schedule students into courses that will provide the opportunity to successfully earn a dual enrollment credit, or pass an AP, IB, and/or industry certification exam.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Mandy Craven (mandy.craven@polk-fl.net)

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

<b>Description</b>	Monitor and track students, by cohort, access to, and progress in successfully passing a dual enrollment, AP, or IB course, or an industry certification exam.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Debra Stinson (debra.stinson@polk-fl.net)

## Part V: Budget

<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
---------------	---------------