Bartow Elementary Academy

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bartow Elementary Academy

590 WILSON AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

http://www.bartowacademy.com/

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Van Hook

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (73%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Elementary Academy

590 WILSON AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

http://www.bartowacademy.com/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	51%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	A

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 Elementary Academy is a family partnership inspiring today's learners to become tomorrow's leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bartow Elementary Academy is a family partnership dedicated to inspiring and preparing learners to become productive global citizens. Our desire is for everyone to use life skills, technology, and innovative experiences to build tomorrow's leaders.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nelson, Tracy	Principal	Staff evaluations, instructional planning and delivery, student achievement, operations of the building, and all other responsibilities of an elementary school principal.
Jones, Nikki	Assistant Principal	Assist school principal in meeting the goals documented in the school improvement plan
Wolfe, Shari	Instructional Coach	To work with instructional staff and students to ensure understanding and mastery of standards and appropriate instructional strategies to move each child forward academically.
Benfield, Steven	Teacher, ESE	Inclusion teacher for all students receiving ESE services for grades K-5.
Crowley, Lori		Teacher of students receiving Gifted services at BEA

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2015, Sarah Van Hook

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
34

Total number of students enrolled at the school
540

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	92	93	86	76	89	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	526
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	11	5	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	11	17	7	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	6	4	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/20/2021

2020-21 - 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		1	6	3	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions		0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA		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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment		0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment		0	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Dec. 2019 STAR Reading Level 1		0	0	2	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Dec. 2019 STAR Mathematics Level 1		0	1	0	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	1	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	1	6	3	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Dec. 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	2	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Dec. 2019 STAR Mathematics Level 1	0	1	0	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	1	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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 Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				77%	51%	57%	85%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	51%	58%	67%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31%	49%	53%	58%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				83%	57%	63%	85%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				61%	56%	62%	56%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	47%	51%	63%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				78%	47%	53%	79%	53%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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
03	2021					
	2019	83%	52%	31%	58%	25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	77%	48%	29%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	47%	26%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	87%	56%	31%	62%	25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	80%	56%	24%	64%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2021					
	2019	83%	51%	32%	60%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	78%	45%	33%	53%	25%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Kindergarten Smarty Ants and STAR Early Lit
Grades 1-5 STAR Reading and Math

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	69	89	87
	Economically Disadvantaged	55	79	76
	Students With Disabilities	80	100	100
	English Language Learners	-	-	100
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	87	83	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	79	64	55
	Students With Disabilities	100	100	60
	English Language Learners	-	-	-

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	66	85	88
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	77	79
	Students With Disabilities	57	80	86
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	74	78	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	64	82	75
	Students With Disabilities	71	43	86
	English Language Learners	-	-	-

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	82	82	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	74	65	74
	Students With Disabilities	50	67	67
	English Language Learners	-	-	-
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	80	81	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	87	81	68
	Students With Disabilities	50	80	40
	English Language Learners	-	-	-

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	81	78	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	75	78	75
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	25
	English Language Learners	100	100	75
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76	78	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	71	88	70
	Students With Disabilities	50	33	-
	English Language Learners	50	75	25

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61	64	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	56	52	58
	Students With Disabilities	25	-	-
	English Language Learners	60	20	50
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65	60	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	56	52
	Students With Disabilities	-	25	-
	English Language Learners	40	60	40
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66	52	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	59	48	80
	Students With Disabilities	-	-	33
	English Language Learners	65	52	83

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	27			18							
ELL	64			55							
BLK	62	30	10	44	20	25	42				
HSP	67	42		48	21		58				
WHT	76	52		60	18		67				
FRL	61	31		56	19	27	58				
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	45			67							
BLK	61	39	43	74	65	62	50				
HSP	72	41	18	80	56		73				
WHT	84	46	29	86	61	38	86				

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
FRL	66	36	19	77	48	43	70				

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
BLK	74	52	50	63	48	43	63				
HSP	76	69	62	88	66	82	73				
WHT	90	70	59	90	55	68	85				
FRL	77	62	57	75	48	55	71				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	295
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	60
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

Native American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	55
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	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The following trends have been documented over the past few years:
The data listed below is based on 2019 FSA data.
a. Third grade performs higher in ELA and Math than fourth and fifth grade.
b. Fifth grade performs lower in ELA but higher in Math.
c. Fourth grade performs between third and fifth grades in ELA and Math.
d. The subgroups that perform at a lower level are SWD at 45%, Black at 61%, and Hispanic at 66% proficiency levels.
e. Learning Gains range from 36%-46% with our FR students scoring at 36%.
f. Learning Gains for the L25 range from 18%-43% with our Hispanic students scoring at 18%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data below is based on data from 2019 and demonstrates the greatest need for improvement:
a. Black students in ELA proficiency went from 74% to 61%, a decrease of 13%.
b. Learning gains for black students dropped from 52% to 39%, a decrease of 13%.
c. Learning gains for L25 for black students dropped from 50% to 43%, a decrease of 13%.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement?
a. Inconsistencies in the implementation of differentiated instruction and targeted interventions
b. Lack of quality small group instruction and progress monitoring
c. Fluctuation of students and teachers transitioning back and forth from virtual to brick and mortar
d. Excessive absenteeism of students and teachers due to quarantine, illness, and other

What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?
a. A detailed schedule will be followed with a checklist of what needs to be seen during instructional time
throughout the school day. This will be completed and monitored by school administrators, instructional
coach, and other support staff.
b. Classroom observations with immediate feedback and professional development assigned by teacher to
enhance areas of opportunity.
c. Administrators will closely monitor attendance of staff and students. Administration will conduct conferences
with parents and staff to encourage and explain the importance of being in school. District policy will be
followed with the assistance of our social worker.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The subgroups below showed the most improvement:
a. Black students improved overall in math: Proficiency went up from 63% to 74%; learning gains went up from

48% to 65%; and learning gains for the lowest 25% went up from 43% to 62%.
b. White students improved learning gains in math from 55% to 61%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Contributing factors to this improvement included:
a. Departmentalizing in fourth and fifth grade has allowed teachers to maintain a focus and enhance their
instructional practices. However, there is still work to be done.
b. Utilized technology using Ten Marks to differentiate based on students' level of mastery.
c. Moved toward student led learning to increase accountability for each student for their personal success.
d. Added use of interactive notebooks in second grade, which students used as study guides within the
classroom and preparation for quizzes and tests.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Our plan includes implementing the strategies listed below with fidelity to accelerate learning:
a. Increase levels of complexity within each content area
b. Provide model teachers and classrooms throughout the school
c. Conduct learning PLCs to improve instructional practices overall
d. Consistency in MTSS process and implementation of targeted interventions
e. Assign accountability partners for staff and students

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will be provided on an individual level based on teacher needs. It will include:
a. PLCs assigned by administration based on needs and data collection
b. EPIC - assign books to each child based on their aptitude level
c. PD on Demand in Schoology allows administrators to assign PD and teachers to receive PD they are
interested in during the year.
d. PD on how to understand data and use it to drive all instructional decisions

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional services will be implemented to sustain improvement for the future and is as follows:
a. Conduct monthly data chats with teachers and students
b. MTSS monthly meetings to review data and practices around intervention with guidance counselor
c. Assign accountability partners for students and staff
d. Vertical conversations scheduled throughout the school year
e. Multi-grade level instructional conversations
f. Regularly scheduled faculty meetings
g. Ensure reading and writing in every content area, every period, every day

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our learning gains percentages, if teachers improve the core instruction (Tier 1) including small groups with differentiated instruction, then students will be authentically engaged in challenging work that would develop their levels of cognitive complexity and mastery of skills.
Measurable Outcome:	We expect to see higher complexity activities being worked on by self-directed teams in all classrooms. Providing students with opportunities to collaborate, discuss, set goals, choose materials and organize the process, would lead to greater independence and higher levels of achievement. The ultimate outcome would be to move overall proficiency in ELA from 77% to 88%; learning gains from 45% to 50%; and our lowest 25% from 31% to 38%. We would like to move our science proficiency from 78% to 82%. Finally, we would like to move our overall proficiency in math from 83% to 88%; learning gains from 61% to 65%; and our lowest 25% from 52% to 60%.
Monitoring:	* Monitor appropriate instructional strategies * Use of instructional targets and success criteria to drive instruction * The schools leadership team will monitor on-going assessments at the school and district levels * Use of rubrics and teacher feedback to provide consistent pathways for learning * Use of data chats to guide instructional decisions and activities to ensure learning gains for each child
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Nelson (tracy.nelson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to address this area of focus we will have targeted collaborative planning with administration of the instructional coach to focus on small differentiated groups, student specific needs, fluency, and vocabulary.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use the following to monitor the effectiveness of implementation in the are of focus: Administrative team and instructional coach will monitor implementation of core instruction and differentiated instruction, structured blocks with schedules posted by content area in each classroom, utilization of CHAMPS and positive classroom management (PBIS)/Restorative Practices.

Action Steps to Implement

PD on Demand in Schoology based on data collected during classroom observations

Person Responsible	Shari Wolfe (shari.wolfe@polk-fl.net)

Weekly targeted collaborative planning with administration to ensure appropriate grouping of students for small group differentiated instruction,

Person Responsible	Tracy Nelson (tracy.nelson@polk-fl.net)

Utilize progress monitoring results from STAR, Smarty Ants, FRECKLE, iStation, district quarterly writing and science assessments to group students for future instruction

Person Responsible	Nikki Jones (nikki.jones@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will conduct monthly data chats with students to review progress and set new academic goals

Person Responsible   Tracy Nelson (tracy.nelson@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based of the latest ESSA Report, a trend appears in the performance of our black students in ELA; proficiency decreased from 74% to 61%, learning gains decreased from 52% to 39%, and learning gains for the lowest 25% decreased from 50% to 43%. This was a overall decrease of 13% of each of these categories. Learning gains for our economically disadvantaged students was 36%. Hispanic students documented an 18% proficiency on learning gains of the lowest 25%.
Measurable Outcome:	We expect to increase proficiency with our African American subgroup from 61% to 65%; we will increase learning gains from 39% to 45% and learning gains for the lowest 25 from 43% to 49%. Our Economically Disadvantaged group will show an increase in learning gains from 36% to 42%; and Hispanic students will demonstrate an increase in learning gains from 18% to 25%.
Monitoring:	instruction during their ELA blocks. MTSS interventions will be implemented to ensure consistent progress of each student in the above subgroups. The ESSA subgroups will document an increase in learning gains on on-going assessments, weekly unit assessments, and progress monitoring tools from beginning of year to end of year. Additionally, learning gains will be shown of FSA 2021-2022 result for students in the subgroups above.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nikki Jones (nikki.jones@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use the following to monitor the effectiveness of implementation in his area of focus: administration will conduct monthly data chats with students and teachers, review MTSS documentation during monthly grade level meetings, monitor small group differentiated instruction during classroom observations, daily walk-throughs and weekly lesson plans. Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: The strategies chosen will provide weekly progress reports to analyze d
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategies chosen will provide weekly progress reports to analyze data and make instructional decisions appropriate for each child's learning pathway. Adjustments in instruction and interventions will be made in a timely manner thus assuring that all students are moving forward.

Action Steps to Implement

* MTSS monthly meeting to monitor student progress and adjust interventions

Person Responsible	Shari Wolfe (shari.wolfe@polk-fl.net)

* Lesson plans, observations and classroom walk-throughs
* Analyze data from on-going assessments
* Weekly assessment data

Person Responsible	Tracy Nelson (tracy.nelson@polk-fl.net)

* Data chats with teachers and students

Person Responsible Nikki Jones (nikki.jones@polk-fl.net)

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

BEA will continue to utilize Restorative Practices, CHAMPS, and Harmony to maintain a positive working environment.

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.

Bartow Elementary Academy seeks to build positive relationships with all stakeholders in a variety of ways.
1. Parent nights throughout the school year
2. Award ceremonies
3. Weekly communication folders
4. Parent/Teacher conferences

5. School website, Facebook page
6. Member of Chamber of Commerce
7. Participation in community events
8. Veteran's Program for the community
9. Hosting school tours for new parents
10. PTA family events: Sweets with Your Sweeties, Fall Festival, Turkey Trot
11. Talent Show
12. Bartow High School and teacher academy
13. Host interns from local universities
14. Community sponsored events held in our auditorium
15. Partner/relationships with local churches through the use of our facilities and their assistance in donating supplies to children on campus

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

BEA staff, students, parents and community members all play a significant role in promoting a positive collaborative culture and environment at our school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00