St. Johns County School District

# Bartram Trail High School



# 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# 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**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | High School<br>9-12 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | No |
| **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 4% |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (68%)<br><br>2017-18: A (68%)<br><br>2016-17: A (70%)<br><br>2015-16: A (67%)<br><br>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

# 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 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of students enrolled | 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 | 59 | 58 | 98 | 116 | 331 |
| One or more suspensions | 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 | 15 | 42 | 28 | 8 | 93 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 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 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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<br>Pull outs through a dedicated ESE teacher certified in Math<br>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** | 1. Continue to improve the PLC process to support instruction; utilize data from assessments to look for upward trends in our PLC meetings<br>2. Utilize additional ESE staff with instruction<br>3. Work with district curriculum on additional strategies<br>4. Peer tutoring<br>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<br>Co-teach Geography and World History<br>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** | 1. Continue to improve the PLC process to support instruction<br>2. Examine the data derived from common assessments to assess effectiveness.<br>3. Monitor co-teach model and support with district office assistance<br>4. Utilize Achieve 3000 data and lexile levels to support student instruction<br>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<br>Sources of Strength<br>Digital Citizenship<br>Be the Light<br>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<br>2. Continue to create culture of great habits that carry beyond high school<br>3.<br>4.<br>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 |