

St. Johns County School District

Bartram Trail High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Bartram Trail High School

7399 LONGLEAF PINE PKWY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-bths.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Chris Phelps

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	4%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (67%) 2014-15: A (80%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Bartram Trail High School

7399 LONGLEAF PINE PKWY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-bths.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	6%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	21%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

BTHS serves as a center for academic excellence, community involvement and character development, while fostering a joy for lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bartram Trail High School will grow as a center of academic excellence, while developing our future leaders in a diverse and changing society. All partners in learning will be dedicated to character development and community involvement, while equipping students to be successful and responsible citizens.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Phelps, Chris	Principal	The Leadership Team includes the Principal, Assistant Principals, Dean, Counselors and Instructional Literacy Coaches. This working group meets bi-weekly. This team maintains RTI Tier procedures and goals as well as input regarding academic and behavioral areas that need to be addressed. The Principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school sit standards.
Lay, Joe	Assistant Principal	
Abbs, Trevor	Assistant Principal	
Huber, Amy	Instructional Coach	
Roughan, Melissa	Registrar	
Abell, Lauren	Assistant Principal	
Peaver, Pete	Dean	
Hinson, Megan	Instructional Coach	
Raimann, Parker	Assistant Principal	

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	0	0	0	0	716	678	659	598	2651
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	58	98	116	331
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	28	76	30	163
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	42	28	8	93
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	46	39	22	146

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	0	0	0	17	28	54	26	125	

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	6	1	3	5	15	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	1	9	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 7/22/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	82	110	130	399
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	33	46	36	210
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	37	42	47	143
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	54	38	22	153

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	0	0	0	40	40	52	50	182	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	82	110	130	399
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	33	46	36	210
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	37	42	47	143
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	54	38	22	153

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	0	0	0	40	40	52	50	182

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	75%	74%	56%	78%	73%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	60%	51%	60%	59%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	42%	51%	50%	41%
Math Achievement	75%	73%	51%	77%	69%	49%
Math Learning Gains	48%	58%	48%	54%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	55%	45%	49%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	87%	86%	68%	89%	84%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	89%	88%	73%	91%	86%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	716 (0)	678 (0)	659 (0)	598 (0)	2651 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	59 (77)	58 (82)	98 (110)	116 (130)	331 (399)
One or more suspensions	29 (95)	28 (33)	76 (46)	30 (36)	163 (210)
Course failure in ELA or Math	15 (17)	42 (37)	28 (42)	8 (47)	93 (143)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	39 (39)	46 (54)	39 (38)	22 (22)	146 (153)

Grade Level Data

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	76%	75%	1%	55%	21%
	2018	75%	74%	1%	53%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	73%	74%	-1%	53%	20%
	2018	77%	76%	1%	53%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

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
2019	86%	87%	-1%	67%	19%
2018	85%	84%	1%	65%	20%
Compare		1%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	89%	88%	1%	70%	19%
2018	89%	87%	2%	68%	21%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	79%	-5%	61%	13%
2018	75%	79%	-4%	62%	13%
Compare		-1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	81%	-4%	57%	20%
2018	70%	77%	-7%	56%	14%
Compare		7%			

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	30	37	33	43	37	32	53	57		95	26
ASN	88	60		89	48		92	89		100	82
BLK	54	47	30	54	39	19	54	80		94	42
HSP	70	57	53	68	49	47	90	83		97	62
MUL	68	32		85	27		93	91		100	58
WHT	76	59	49	77	49	44	89	90		98	64
FRL	54	38	27	50	30	16	76	76		83	49
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	32	34	29	40	39	36	50	63		87	35
ASN	95	69		91	62		94	92		100	74
BLK	58	54	42	48	42	40	73	70		100	40
HSP	71	56	38	69	48	32	84	84		97	53
MUL	85	63		81	72						
WHT	77	55	44	74	55	45	87	90		96	64
FRL	59	43	32	61	48	53	70	76		86	57
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	32	38	36	44	30	26	47	73		94	26
ASN	87	76		82	59		95	88			
BLK	66	54	50	56	48	40	73	85		93	36
HSP	72	55	35	73	54	35	88	92		100	74
MUL	94	75		76	58			92			
WHT	79	60	51	79	54	51	90	92		96	58
FRL	62	54	52	61	39	40	73	86		89	33

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)	N/A

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	684
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	68
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	69
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	70
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Math Lowest 25th percentile. We maintained a 43% performance level from the year before. We served more freshman and maintained the same performance rate. We plan to continue our service model of 90 minute classes with additional support in the classroom.

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

Math Learning Gains. The school average dropped from 54% two years in a row to 48% last year. Our Math Achievement increased but our gains decreased. We experienced teacher resignation during the year that could have contributed to the decline. We look for this to trend upward with student placement and class size adjustments.

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.

Math Lowest 25th percentile was 43% while the state average was 45%. We had a similar gap last year in this same category. We continued to use our service model of 90 minute classes with additional support in the classroom.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. The school average increased from 43% to 48%. We worked hard on improving our PLC process, utilized tutors in 9th grade and reduced class size of ELA classes.

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

Many of our data points showed significant drops with an increased enrollment. The one area of concern is our Level 1 on statewide assessments.

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

1. Math Lowest 25th Percentile
2. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
3. Math Learning Gains
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Lowest 25 Percentile
Rationale	The performance of our lowest 25 percentile was 43% gains. By focusing our efforts on this group of low achieving students and providing them with deliberate scheduling we will be able to impact students learning opportunity and will be looking for improvement across the LQ 25%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We hope to achieve a 50% learning gain for the lowest 25 percentile or at minimum a 2% gain.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chris Phelps (chris.phelps@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Common planning for Algebra Teachers Pull outs through a dedicated ESE teacher certified in Math Math ILC working directly with Algebra and Geometry teachers
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Implemented 4 90 minute blocks of Algebra for lowest achieving students as well as 6 sections of LAM for students who will be retaking Algebra test in the fall to continue to work on math concepts. Created common planning for our Algebra teachers to focus on engagements strategies, pacing and data analysis. The math ILC will work directly with our teachers to share strategies. We support the math classes with an ESE teacher who is math certified to assist with instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue to improve the PLC process to support instruction; utilize data from assessments to look for upward trends in our PLC meetings 2. Utilize additional ESE staff with instruction 3. Work with district curriculum on additional strategies 4. Peer tutoring 5. Common Formative
Person Responsible	Lauren Abell (lauren.abell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA Lowest 25 Percentile
Rationale	The performance of our lowest 25 percentile was 48%. English 1 and 2, Leadership, Geography and World History co-teach PLC groups will be focusing efforts on FSA scores inside the School Data dashboard to identify the comprehension trends that we can have the most direct impact on students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We hope to achieve a 50% learning gain for lowest 25 percentile students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chris Phelps (chris.phelps@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Reduced Class size of ELA 1 and 2 Co-teach Geography and World History Utilize Achieve 3000
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We scheduled our class size of ELA 1 and 2 to be at 20. Also increased our ESE support to 2x per week in the hopes of assisting our LQ 25. We have also utilized the district initiative co-teach model in Geography and World History to assist our LQ 25 by teaching reading in the content area. These teachers are utilizing Achieve 3000 to supplement the classroom. We continue to refine our PLC process and work with the district to implement the reading curriculum.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue to improve the PLC process to support instruction 2. Examine the data derived from common assessments to assess effectiveness. 3. Monitor co-teach model and support with district office assistance 4. Utilize Achieve 3000 data and lexile levels to support student instruction 5. Common Formative Assessments
Person Responsible	Parker Raimann (parker.raimann@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Citizenship
Rationale	Focus for the year in class meetings was -- "Don't count the days, Make the days count." Find opportunities to help others during your time at school, make a situation better, be a positive influence and make each day count.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Continue to create culture based on Bear Standards --- Be on time, be prepared, be respectful and give your best effort. We continue to make this a topic at class meetings and class visits and work with Link crew, clubs and intern programs throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Pete Peaver (pete.peaver@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Link Crew Sources of Strength Digital Citizenship Be the Light Sportsmanship speech before athletic events
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We are looking multiple opportunities for student leadership and making the most of your time at Bartram Trail High School. Link Crew and Be the Light are established programs that allow students to impact other students. Sources of Strength is a new program also helping to create student leaders on campus. Reading a pledge of sportsmanship before all athletic events share the character counts pillars with our community.
Action Step	
Description	1. Monitor student group impact on peers 2. Continue to create culture of great habits that carry beyond high school 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Trevor Abbs (trevor.abbs@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest 25 Percentile	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest 25 Percentile	\$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Citizenship	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00