Bartow Senior High School

2021-22 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: 8/10/2013

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

1270 BROADWAY AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

http://www.bartowhighschool.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)
High School 9-12	No	70%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Clemons, Emilean	Principal	
Craven, Mandy	Other	
Downing, Cynthia	Principal	
Jones, Sharon	Dean	
Brown, Kerry	Assistant Principal	
Austin, Angie	Assistant Principal	
Simmers, Todd	Assistant Principal	
Stinson, Debra	Dean	
Shweil, Mahammad	Assistant Principal	
Floyd, Christie	Reading Coach	
Lawson, Lance	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 8/10/2013, 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

109

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,186

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

24

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

22

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	679	597	451	419	2146
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157	126	116	93	492
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	189	183	136	116	624
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	231	110	83	64	488
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	91	58	50	43	242

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	49	35	27	12	123
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	23	13	16	71

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/26/2021

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	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

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	679	597	451	419	2146
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	134	124	112	541
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	94	63	43	287
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	71	94	52	323
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	44	53	35	200
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	97	84	59	345
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	109	78	57	347

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	189	146	143	108	586

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	49	35	27	12	123
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	23	13	16	71

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				49%	47%	56%	45%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	46%	51%	45%	47%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	37%	42%	30%	39%	44%
Math Achievement				48%	43%	51%	42%	44%	51%
Math Learning Gains				55%	45%	48%	46%	42%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	44%	45%	41%	38%	45%
Science Achievement				57%	58%	68%	51%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				62%	61%	73%	57%	63%	71%

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
09	2021					
	2019	51%	45%	6%	55%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	47%	42%	5%	53%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

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**
2021					
2019	56%	54%	2%	67%	-11%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	61%	57%	4%	70%	-9%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	35%	50%	-15%	61%	-26%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	57%	53%	4%	57%	0%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Reading STAR
Math STAR
Writing Progress Monitoring
Quarterly Assessment Biology, U.S. History, Algebra 1

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17	14	12
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	11	9
	Students With Disabilities	7	4	3
	English Language Learners	4		4
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33	52	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	43	37
	Students With Disabilities		24	20
	English Language Learners		14	14
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11	10	11
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	10	6
	Students With Disabilities	3	3	5
	English Language Learners		6	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50	16	12
	Economically Disadvantaged	100	17	12
	Students With Disabilities		2	
	English Language Learners		11	
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	15	9
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	6	5
	Students With Disabilities	23	7	
	English Language Learners	11	11	8
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		13	14
	Economically Disadvantaged		7	10
	Students With Disabilities		6	12
	English Language Learners		20	17
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

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	10	22	23	16	17	15	24	39		98	35
ELL	15	29	28	14	21	29	33	25		95	37
ASN	89	69					93			100	87
BLK	27	32	25	15	16	14	36	43		98	61
HSP	43	42	34	27	23	23	56	54		97	59

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
MUL	50	44					90			93	54
WHT	50	43	27	29	26	29	62	70		93	70
FRL	29	31	28	18	18	21	43	47		94	54

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

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	519
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	88
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	37
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	46
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	66
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	
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	50
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	41
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?

There was a decrease in Math and ELA achievement scores across grade levels.

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

Students with disabilities and English Language Learners.

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

ELL students were with a substitute for the majority of the year. School-wide we faced challenges with providing general education teachers resources for, and implementing accommodations for, our ESE students. We also had a low percentage of students who were assessed through progress monitoring because of eLearning and other factors.

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

Proficiency in Science remained the same.

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

Teachers were more intentional in ensuring that the Biology standards were taught. Science has a strong department chair who led collaborative planning for the department.

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

Data chats. In PLC's and school-wide we will need to discuss remediation strategies for our students with disabilities, ELL students, and students who fall in the bottom quartile.

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.

Standards Based Grading.
ESE Updates & Information.
Data driven Instructional Strategies school-wide.
MTSS process to tier students and offer supports.

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

9th Grade Collaboration with Students, Teachers and Parents to ensure successful transitioning into high school.
AVID Elective Classrooms to target College and Career Readiness Skills.
PBIS Framework to build a positive culture and climate for the school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	PBIS improves social, emotional and academic outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities and students from under-represented groups. In a data review of the Benchmarks of Quality for school-wide PBIS, the school increased from 23% in the 2020 school year to 42% during the 2021 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	The Benchmarks of Quality score for school-wide Positive Behavioral interventions and Support (PBIS) will increase to 48% for the 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	PBIS Committee Meetings monthly to identify areas for improvement for school-wide implementation using the Benchmarks of Quality scoring guide, Progress monitoring of action plans by PBIS committee, Professional Development on PBIS for all stakeholder of the school, Collaboration with the district PBIS Coach.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Emilean Clemons (emilean.clemons@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Benchmarks of Quality Scoring Guide and the Florida PBIS Live Binder/Canvas Modules.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Benchmarks of Quality Scoring Guide and Florida PBIS Framework provide support, guidance and professional development for guiding the PBIS team in Tier 1 School-Wide implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support.

Action Steps to Implement	
Data chats with PBIS team on the Benchmarks of Quality Scoring Guide & Develop a Plan of Action. Documentation of Professional Learning with all stakeholders of the school. Participation in Professional Development using the Florida PBIS Live Binder and Canvas Courses.	
Person Responsible	Kerry Brown (kerry.brown@polk-fl.net)
Data Analyisis of Benchmarks of Quality Scoring Guide	
Person Responsible	Kerry Brown (kerry.brown@polk-fl.net)
Professional Development related to PBIS for Administration, PBIS Committe, all stakeholders of the school	
Person Responsible	Kerry Brown (kerry.brown@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In a data review of the 2021 Math proficiency scores, the school dropped signifcantly from 48% in 2019 to 24% proficient in 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	Bartow High School will increase the 2022 FSA Math proficiency score to 32%.
Monitoring:	Progress Monitoring, Professional Learning Communities Collaboration, Standards-based grading.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lance Lawson (lance.lawson@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	Lance Lawson (lance.lawson@polk-fl.net)
Professional development related to collaborative structures.	
Person Responsible	Christie Floyd (christie.floyd@polk-fl.net)
Professional development related to SWD	
Person Responsible	Angie Austin (angie.austin@polk-fl.net)

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.

In a evaluation of 2019 SESIR data, two areas of concerns were tobacco and fighting. The school will continue to monitor these areas by using PBIS and the MTSS process to identify students for discipline. A plan will be implemented to target subgroups with positive intervention and support. Data chats will take place monthly with discipline and the PBIS team to monitor progress.

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.

Established PBIS, a school-wide framework for setting positive expectations and rewards for students.
Promote Preparation, Respect, Integrity, Dedication and Engagement (PRIDE) as the school acronym for classrooms and common areas.
Provide Professional Development for teachers, staff and students on PBIS and School-Wide PRIDE expectations.
Provide positive recognition for staff and students who embrace the school culture and environment.
The Leadership Team is participating in a Deliberate Practice Study using the book, Leverage Leadership, 2.0 to further build sustainability with PBIS and the school culture.
New Teacher Induction Program- Provide resources and supports to new teachers for successful integration into the school and teaching.

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

Community and Parent Stakeholders- The BESTT Organization, Captain's Council and Friends of IB committee support the school through financial and in-kind donations to promote and recognize student academic performance, students making learning gains, PBIS, field trips, classroom enrichment opportunities, and fundraising. The committees support teachers with recognition, classroom materials/ supplies and professional development opportunities. Finally, the committees provide parent support through special guest speakers and parent nights at the school.
The Bartow Athletic Boosters are made of community, business and parent stakeholders who work to support the athletic programs, athletes, facilities and coaches.
Career Technical Education (CTE) Academy Boards are comprised of business partners, parents and community members who work alongside the academy programs to provide support and guidance to ensure that today's students are ready for tomorrow's workforce.
School Advisory Council is made up staff, parents, community and business partners who support the School Improvement Plan and help make decisions pertaining to the SAC funds issued by the state.
Colleges, Military and Technical Schools partner with the schools to promote college fairs and tours to help students in planning for post-secondary options.
PCSB District Support staff for academic coaching and support for all content areas and workforce education.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00