

St. Johns County School District

Bartram Trail High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 7/1/2015

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)	4%
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: A (68%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (67%)
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 2/16/2021.

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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Bartram Trail High School

7399 LONGLEAF PINE PKWY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>High School 9-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>3%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>25%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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	
Huber, Amy	Instructional Coach	
Roughan, Melissa	Registrar	
Salas, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Peaver, Pete	Dean	
Raimann, Parker	Assistant Principal	
Sands, Kerri	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Chris Phelps

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.*

1

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.*

23

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

134

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)	4%
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: A (68%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (67%)
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 .	

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	800	739	688	662	2889
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	50	30	62	175
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	36	39	54	161
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	54	54	49	206
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	54	53	49	206
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	25	24	21	100
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	25	24	21	100

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	49	49	42	52	192

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/20/2020

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

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

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	
	(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	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

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
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
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	68
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	69
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	70
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.

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?

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. 1. Math Lowest 25th Percentile
2. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
3. Math Learning Gains
4. Provide additional assistance to Distance Learners

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and 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 student learning opportunity and will be looking for improvement across the LQ25%.

Measurable Outcome: We hope to achieve 60% learning gains for the lowest 25 percent students 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 out through a dedicated ESE teacher certified in math
 Math coach working directly with Geometry and Algebra 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 Steps to Implement

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: Kerri Sands (kerri.sands@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The performance of our lowest 25 percentile was 48%. English 1 and 2, Intensive Reading, 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.

Measurable Outcome: We hope to achieve 50% learning gains for the 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
Created Intensive Reading classes
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 Steps to Implement

1. Continue to improve the PLC process to support instruction
2. Examine the data derived from common assessments to assess effectiveness.
3. Monitor Intensive Reading class 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. Other specifically relating to Citizenship

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Focus for the year in class meetings will again be -- "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.

Measurable Outcome: 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 NHS 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 Steps to Implement

1. Monitor student group impact on peers
2. Continue to create culture of great habits that carry beyond high school

Person Responsible: Amy Huber (amy.huber@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We have assigned one of our Assistant Principals plus a teacher on assignment to help identify and track those students who are struggling with the distance learning option we initiated this year. We are using last years results from the 4th quarter to help identify possible struggling learners.

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.

The teachers are the engine to the learning process at Bartram Trail. As we enter this unique year we have taken on the collective responsibility of helping each other during the distance learning process. We spent almost the entire preplanning process focusing how to use Schoology with distance learners. We not only have a Schoology champion and our media specialist focusing on helping our staff, but multiple teachers have stepped up and provided multiple popup trainings to assist teachers. We have created a live document to house all the wonderful tools and tips that teachers have shared. We will continue this process during the 1st semester and offer sub times for teachers to watch other teachers.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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