Bartow Senior High School

2020-21 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: 6/8/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
2019-20 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%)
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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	65%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Clemons, Emilean	Principal	
Craven, Mandy	Principal	
Austin, Angie	Assistant Principal	
Jones, Sharon	Dean	
Stinson, Debra	Dean	
Lawson, Lance	Assistant Principal	
Downing, Cynthia	Principal	Summerlin Principal
Simmers, Todd	Assistant Principal	Summerlin AP

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/8/2020, Lance Lawson A

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

125

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	621	535	462	4	1622
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	56	40	4	164
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	93	75	0	280
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	107	92	73	4	276

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	32	13	8	1	54
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	25	18	1	58

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 6/8/2020

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	
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	

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	
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	

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**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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	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%	0
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%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Native American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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.

Student with Disabilities.
Contributing factors - scheduling issues, strategies/accommodations professional development, teachers awareness of students' academic needs.

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

Algebra 1 EOC. High teacher turnover. New content for some teachers.

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.

Algebra 1 EOC. High teacher turnover. New content for some teachers.

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

Geometry. Collaborative planning/PLC's, veteran teachers in that content area, administrative support, standards based grading.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

9th Graders
Students with Disabilities

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

1. 9th Grade Prevention/Support
2. PLC's with fidelity
3. School Culture
4. Increase student attendance
5. Increase Online learning Potential (Single Platform)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Overall SWD Student Achievement - ELA and Science achievement increased in 2019, however, are still significantly below district and state averages. Math and Social Studies decreased in 2019. Additionally the gap increased compared to district and state data.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA increase to 18% proficient Math increase to 25% proficient Science increase to 28% proficient Social Studies increase to 36% proficient
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Emilean Clemons (emilean.clemons@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative structures implementation in instruction across all content areas Standards-based grading
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative structures and standards-based grading will increase student engagement and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development related to standards-based grading.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Professional development related to collaborative structures.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Professional development related to SWD.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	9th grade students scored the lowest in all areas related to EWS except for one. Utilizing PBIS and a 9th grade counselor will impact student learning as well improve culture and school environment.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce the number of 9th grade students with attendance below 90% from 10% to 7% for the 20-21 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angie Austin (angie.austin@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	9th grade monitoring
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	10% of 9th grade students attended less than 90% school days.

Action Steps to Implement

9th grade counselor to schedule individual freshman conferences; quarterly 9th grade parent meetings; quarterly 9th grade assemblies; PBIS

Person Responsible	Lance Lawson (lance.lawson@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

PBIS Team
Student Leadership
JROTC

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00