Bartow Senior High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bartow Senior High School

1270 BROADWAY AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

http://www.bartowhighschool.com/

Demographics

Principal: Lance Lawson A

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2019

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)	86%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (44%) 2014-15: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

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

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)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Clemons, Emilean	Principal	
Craven, Mandy	Assistant Principal	
Austin, Angie	Assistant Principal	
Jones, Sharon	Dean	
Stinson, Debra	Dean	
Crowley, Kelly	Instructional Coach	
Lawson, Lance	Assistant Principal	
Downing, Cynthia	Principal	Summerlin Principal
Dorman, Melinda	Teacher, K-12	
Vazquez, Yelia	Teacher, K-12	
Leon, Tamaria	Teacher, K-12	
Andrews, Brian	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	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	43	26	40	152
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	1	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	71	39	66	242
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	162	141	147	650

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	77	59	32	51	219

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	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
110

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/26/2019

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	167	170	180	195	712
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	69	44	42	249
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190	246	149	73	658

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	0	0	0	0	

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	167	170	180	195	712
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	69	44	42	249
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190	246	149	73	658

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	0	0	0	0	

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	49%	47%	56%	45%	44%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	46%	51%	42%	41%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	37%	42%	32%	33%	41%
Math Achievement	48%	43%	51%	36%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	55%	45%	48%	38%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	44%	45%	31%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	57%	58%	68%	52%	56%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	62%	61%	73%	60%	60%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	43 (167)	43 (170)	26 (180)	40 (195)	152 (712)
One or more suspensions	4 (94)	3 (69)	5 (44)	1 (42)	13 (249)
Course failure in ELA or Math	66 (0)	71 (0)	39 (0)	66 (0)	242 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	200 (190)	162 (246)	141 (149)	147 (73)	650 (658)

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	51%	45%	6%	55%	-4%
	2018	47%	43%	4%	53%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	47%	42%	5%	53%	-6%
	2018	46%	42%	4%	53%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	56%	54%	2%	67%	-11%
2018	50%	59%	-9%	65%	-15%
Compare		6%			

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	61%	57%	4%	70%	-9%
2018	56%	57%	-1%	68%	-12%
Compare		5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	35%	50%	-15%	61%	-26%
2018	43%	60%	-17%	62%	-19%
Compare		-8%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	53%	4%	57%	0%
2018	39%	41%	-2%	56%	-17%
Compare		18%			

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	15	36	36	22	50	42	25	33		78	13
ELL	17	40	42	27	56		33	21		77	43
ASN	86	69		86	55		93	100		100	94
BLK	38	46	38	42	46	45	41	46		86	43
HSP	41	47	37	39	47	38	51	50		90	58
MUL	73	62		46	45		80	75		71	70
WHT	53	51	39	56	64	58	62	69		89	61
FRL	36	46	35	39	53	51	42	54		84	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	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

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	607
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	85
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	47
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	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
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	60
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.

Students with disabilities showed the lowest level of performance of our subgroups. There are several factors that contributed to last year's low performance. There was an unequal distribution of ESE students in some classes. We needed to do a better job of identifying equitable numbers of ESE students in each class. Based on observation data from Journey we need to improve on student engagement. We also need to improve on higher order thinking questions based on observation data. Managing student behavior and classroom procedures are contributing factors to low performance among SWD based on discipline and observation data.

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

Last year Algebra 1 showed the greatest decline from the previous year because there was a lot of teacher turnover with the Algebra 1 classes last year. There were 1st year teachers and long term substitutes managing Algebra 1 classes for a large portion of the school year.

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.

Social Studies Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average because we had a few teachers teaching extra periods which didn't allow them to have a common planning period with their peers. The lack of common planning prohibited strategic planning among peers. Based on the master schedule teachers were required to teach multiple preps which contributed to the gap between us and the state.

The Science Achievement gap occurred based on limited collaborative planning.

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

Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest 25% showed the most improvement because we made a very conscious decision to focus on collaborative planning in geometry. Geometry also had veteran teachers.

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

Poor attendance is an area of concern for improving achievement among all subgroups because of our poor attendance.

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

1. We will increase Student Engagement
2. We will increase SWD Math Achievement in Algebra and Geometry.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Student Engagement
Rationale	Higher the student engagement the larger the increase in student achievement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the EPC, student engagement, as determined by classroom observation data from 36% to 40%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Emilean Clemons (emilean.clemons@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	AVID LSI
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	LSI assists teachers with increasing rigor and target-task alignment. AVID is utilized to increase student engagement through collaborative structures and WICOR Strategies.

Action Step	
Description	1. LSI Team meetings 2. AVID Team meetings 3. Collaborative Planning 4. PLC's 5. Strategic Priority Planning
Person Responsible	Lance Lawson (lance.lawson@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	SWD Math Achievement
Rationale	This is the one component of the school grade that decreased from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase SWD math achievement from 22% to 25%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lance Lawson (lance.lawson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Collaborative Planning PLC's
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	School data shows, students from teachers who actively participate in Collaborative Planning have higher results.

Action Step	
Description	1. Monthly PLC's 2. Weekly Collaborative Planning 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Lance Lawson (lance.lawson@polk-fl.net)

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: Student Engagement	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: SWD Math Achievement	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**