Bartow Elementary Academy

2022-23 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: 7/14/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (61%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (70%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	75%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nelson, Tracy	Principal	Role of Principal
Jones, Nikki	Assistant Principal	Master Scheduling, PBIS, MTSS, Office Discipline
Wolfe, Shari	Instructional Coach	Campus Induction, coaching and mentoring, lead facilitator of ELA planning and instruction
Crowley, Lori	Teacher, K-12	Gifted Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/14/2022, Sarah Van Hook

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Total number of students enrolled at the school

520

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

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	90	81	87	83	84	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	514
Attendance below 90 percent	9	2	12	6	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	5	3	2	6	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	13	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	9	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	5	3	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	4	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 8/12/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	73%	47%	56%				77%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	68%						45%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						31%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	61%	42%	50%				83%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	60%						61%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						52%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	49%	59%				78%	47%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	83%	52%	31%	58%	25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	77%	48%	29%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2022					
	2019	73%	47%	26%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	87%	56%	31%	62%	25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	80%	56%	24%	64%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2022					
	2019	83%	51%	32%	60%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	78%	45%	33%	53%	25%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	29			29							
BLK	62	64		45	58	55	38				
HSP	69	82		53	61		40				
MUL	50			50							
WHT	78	65	58	67	58	44	65				
FRL	57	60	47	52	51	38	41				

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				
FRL	66	36	19	77	48	43	70				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	428
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	54
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	61
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	50
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	62
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 data component that performed the lowest was our students with disabilities in grades 3-5. This group had 29% proficiency in ELA and 29% proficiency in math. These scores have dropped over the past two years from 45% proficiency in ELA and 67% proficiency in math in 2019.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, continue to document our strongest need is with our student with disabilities.

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

New actions to be taken to address this need for improvement include review of ESE minutes, planning stronger lessons to address individual student goals, aligned tasks based on grade level benchmarks for small group instruction by regular education teachers, and weekly progress monitoring of student data by regular education and ESE staff.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, our black students documented growth in learning gains from 39% to 64% in ELA.

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

During MTSS time, students were broken into smaller groups for instruction: ESE, gifted, bubble students, etc. This allowed each teacher to focus on the students specific academic needs, which ultimately led to an increase in student outcomes.

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

We will improve core instruction by using the Learning Arc Framework to ensure alignment of task with the benchmark, using diagnostic data to ensure appropriate small group placement and instruction, and provide daily equivalent experiences for every child every day.

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.

We will continue to provide on-going training and feedback on the Learning Arc Framework, MTSS, data analysis, and continue to develop self-directed teams to enhance student mastery on content outcomes.

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

Each teacher and child will maintain a data book that will be reviewed by the instructional coach and school administrators monthly. Progress monitoring results will be discussed during PLCs with the instructional and adjustments made to small groups as needed.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	All students will engage in grade level standards aligned tasks and assessments daily. Learning gains have increased over the last 2 state testing opportunities but the proficiency scores have started to decline. If teachers improve and/or maintain levels 3, 4, or 5 in grades 3-5 our overall school proficiency levels for those grade levels will continue to grow. This would enhance overall proficiency performance that supports PCPS District Strategic Plan: Goal 1: Student Outcomes
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	100% of previously proficient students will maintain their achievement level and increase their scale score at a minimum. Also, any student that was proficient in the previous two years and decreased in proficiency will show gains by returning to a level of proficiency. We will achieve this by providing students with opportunities to collaborate, discuss, set goals that would lead to greater independence and higher levels of achievement.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will use a combination of state and district level progress monitoring tools that have a defined line for both proficiency and growth. We will address gender differences by subject area, subgroup, and grade level (gap analysis), providing additional time/support to engage students in equivalent experiences throughout each school day.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Nelson (tracy.nelson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Strategy 1 - Monitoring students engaging in equivalent experiences, aligned to state standards on a daily basis Strategy 2 - Engage teachers in collaborative planning using the Learning Arc Framework to ensure that all students are engaged in equivalent experiences throughout the school year at a high frequency rate
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Research provided by The New Teacher Project (TNTP) shows the importance that all students receive grade level standards-based instruction on a daily basis.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Collaborative planning focused on ensuring all students are engaged in equivalent experiences throughout the year at a high frequency rate

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Proficiency levels have decreased over the last two state assessments. We will focus on strategic interventions for both ELA and math based on diagnostic results. Students will be authentically engaged in challenging work that would develop their levels of cognitive complexity and mastery of skills. This would enhance our overall performance that supports the PCPS district strategic plan: Goal 1: Student Outcomes.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	We will increase our proficiency scores by 10 percentage points over our 2022 outcomes in ELA, math, and science.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The intervention programs will come with progress monitoring tools that we will utilize as well as marked percentile growth on district wide progress monitoring tools. We will utilize our School Based Leadership Team to monitor and analyze information obtained from classroom walkthrough tool to enhance differentiation and student outcomes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Nelson (tracy.nelson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Research based intervention tools will be used on a daily basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The tools being acquired for our intervention programs have success measures that have been monitored over a number of years. The administrative team will continue to monitor the implementation of differentiated instruction, structured blocks in each classroom, utilization of CHAMPS and positive classroom management (PBIS).

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Ensure the master schedule allows for students to engage in a prescriptive intervention instruction daily.

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

Train administration, coaches, and instructional staff on proper implementation of the intervention tools.

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

Administration will conduct classroom observations no less than two days a week.

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

Observation data analysis and response measures protocol will be created and utilized during bi-monthly school based leadership team meetings.

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

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our general referral data has increased over the past two years. A two pronged approach will be created to ensure that a proactive system is supported by a strategic behavioral intervention plan.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The total number of referral will decrease by 10 percentage points.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Recorded referrals will decrease compared to last year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nikki Jones (nikki.jones@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Strategy 1 - Create and implement a well structure PBIS Strategy 2 - Implement a series of behavioral interventions that are focused on both the environment and the individual student(s). Strategy 3 - Conduct social skills groups for students in need
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Well established PBIS systems result in 95%+ of the student population functioning within appropriate behavior parameters. Behavioral interventions are required in any institution that supports the whole child.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Strategy 1 - Create and implement a well structured PBIS system
Action Step 1 - Establish a PBIS team

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

Strategy 1 - Create and implement a well structured PBIS system
Action Step 2 - Create and utilize a progress monitoring system tied to discipline metrics

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

Strategy 1 - Create and implement a well structured PBIS system
Action Step 3 - Leverage business partners to acquire rewards to celebrate student success tied to the PBIS goals

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Strategy 1 - Create and implement a well structured PBIS system
Action Step 4 - PBIS data will be reviewed and responded to at least once a month during school based leadership team meetings.

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

Strategy 2 - Implement a series of behavioral interventions that are focused on both the environment and the individual student(s)
Action Step 1 - Establish and utilize a behavior based comprehensive data file

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

Strategy 2 - Implement a series of behavioral interventions that are focused on both the environment and the individual student(s)
Action Step 2 - Discipline data will be reviewed once a month during school based leadership team meetings.

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

Strategy 2 - Implement a series of behavioral interventions that are focused on both the environment and the individual student(s)
Action Step 3 - Preliminary behavioral interventions will be established by school administration prior to the first day of school.

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

Strategy 3 - Conduct social skills groups for students in need
Action Step 1 - Conduct weekly social skills groups for identified students

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

Strategy 3 - Conduct social skills groups for students in need
Action Step 2 - Guidance and social worker will conduct classroom observations of the students they are servicing

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

Strategy 3 - Conduct social skills groups for students in need
Action Step 2 - Guidance and social worker will maintain records and monitor progress weekly

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

NA

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 community
9. Hosting school tours for new parents
10. PTA family events: Sweets with Your Sweetie, Fall Festival, Turkey Trot, Spirit Nights at local restaurants
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 school culture and environment.

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