

Polk County Public Schools

Bartow Senior High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 7/1/2013

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (53%) 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (50%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	86%
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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		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 High School is a cohesive and diverse learning community, promoting a global perspective. The three schools (Bartow High School, IB Bartow, 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

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
Clemons, Emilean	Principal	
Downing, Cynthia	Principal	
Craven, Mandy	Other	
Austin, Angie	Assistant Principal	
Lawson, Lance	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Kerry	Assistant Principal	
Shweil, Mahammad	Assistant Principal	
Simmers, Todd	Assistant Principal	
Floyd, Christie	Reading Coach	
Stinson, Debra	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Lance Lawson A

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.*

1

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

100

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,167

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

9

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

25

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	633	649	488	400	2170
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	57	33	31	161
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	147	85	60	427
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	64	51	38	193
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	31	25	20	88
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184	205	133	111	633
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156	199	85	56	496
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	4

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155	178	106	102	541

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	38	22	21	82	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	12	12	47	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/11/2022

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	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

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	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

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	48%	41%	51%				49%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	48%						50%	46%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						38%	37%	42%
Math Achievement	32%	35%	38%				48%	43%	51%
Math Learning Gains	45%						55%	45%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						50%	44%	45%
Science Achievement	57%	26%	40%				57%	58%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	63%	39%	48%				62%	61%	73%

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

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
2022					
2019	56%	54%	2%	67%	-11%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	61%	57%	4%	70%	-9%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	35%	50%	-15%	61%	-26%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	57%	53%	4%	57%	0%

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	12	35	33	9	27	33	22	29		96	24
ELL	16	38	33	21	52	64	28	29		96	25
ASN	96	79					100	90		100	91
BLK	30	40	35	29	45	46	44	41		96	28
HSP	48	47	34	28	44	52	59	64		96	51
MUL	44	26		40			83			92	64
WHT	50	50	39	33	43	46	55	66		95	61
FRL	37	43	38	27	44	42	50	51		95	45
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
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

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	33
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	559
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	93
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	58
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	54
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	46
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?

Significant drop in Math and ELA proficiency during 2020-21 school year across all grade levels. Increase in Math and ELA proficiency for the 2021-22 school year although we are not yet back to our pre-covid proficiency levels. Science proficiency remained the same with Social studies increasing slightly. According to our ESSA data, ELL and SWD missed the ESSA target.

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

Math proficiency for the school was 32%, 23 points below the State average.
Science proficiency for the school was 57%, 4 points below the State average.

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

Contributing factors: Student and staff attendance, transitioning back to face-to-face learning. Initiatives to focus on and improve student and staff attendance. All students have transitioned to face-to-face learning. Loss of paraprofessional who worked specifically with ELL students.

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

Math learning gains and Math bottom quartile learning gains.

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

Standards based instruction and grading were implemented department-wide, as well as training specific to these topics.

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

PLCs and focused collaborative planning sessions with intensive support for teachers new to the school. Continued implementation with fidelity of standards-based learning and grading.

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 learning and instruction; data driven instruction; learning arc planning model; SWT

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

Progress monitoring data; pervasive implementation of PBIS; incentives to improve student and staff attendance; focus on participation in accelerated opportunities.

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.

After analyzing an FSA data comparison chart, Math Proficiency scores fell short of the state by 23%; Science scores fell short by 4%.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will increase our Math and Science proficiency by 2%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Collaborative Planning with a focus on Standard-Based Instruction.

Utilizing the School Walk Through data as a coaching tool. Using Progress Monitoring Data to identify trends in our groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emilean Clemons (emilean.clemons@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Evaluating Equivalent Experiences by observing achievement level descriptors with learning objectives and assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We observed a 21% increase in Math Learning Gains during the 21-22 school year due to standard-based instruction with an emphasis on standards-based grading.

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.

Professional Development on Standard-Based Instruction and Grading.
Focus on the alignment of instruction and assessments with the standards.

Person Responsible

Emilean Clemons (emilean.clemons@polk-fl.net)

Calibrate walk throughs using SWT and implementation of The Learning ARC Tool through collaborative planning sessions.

Person Responsible

Emilean Clemons (emilean.clemons@polk-fl.net)

Progress Monitoring Data to guide decision making as it pertains to instructional outcomes

Person Responsible

Todd Simmers (todd.simmers@polk-fl.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

PBIS implemented in all schools; incentives to improve student and staff attendance; safe and secure campus environment

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

Administration leads initiative
Staff implements expectations throughout the campus
SAC and community reinforce PBIS expectations