Bartow Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bartow Middle School

550 CLOWER ST E, Bartow, FL 33830

http://schools.polk-fl.net/bms

Demographics

Principal: Dwayne Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (44%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (49%)
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 Middle School

550 CLOWER ST E, Bartow, FL 33830

http://schools.polk-fl.net/bms

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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	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.

*Our mission:

Bartow Middle School will ensure that ALL students have the skills necessary to reach high levels of academic achievement, respect self and others, and become lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

*Vision:

One Team - One Goal

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
Roberts, Christopher	Principal	
Cleveland, Rhea	Assistant Principal	
Johnson, Dwayne	Assistant Principal	
Shytle, Katie	Assistant Principal	
Keeney, Lauren	Science Coach	
Ehrhart, Eric	School Counselor	
Murren, Barbara	Instructional Technology	
Tyre, Shawn	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/15/2016, Dwayne Johnson

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.*
21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

71

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,050

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

13

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

8

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	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	
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

Wednesday 7/13/2022

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	324	329	314	0	0	0	0	967
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	107	106	0	0	0	0	296
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	51	35	0	0	0	0	130
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	45	51	0	0	0	0	126
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	69	38	0	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	89	70	0	0	0	0	234
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	92	84	0	0	0	0	250
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	136	164	141	0	0	0	0	441

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	173	205	195	0	0	0	0	573

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	6	1	46	0	0	0	0	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	11	0	0	0	0	20

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	324	329	314	0	0	0	0	967
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	107	106	0	0	0	0	296
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	51	35	0	0	0	0	130
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	45	51	0	0	0	0	126
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	69	38	0	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	89	70	0	0	0	0	234
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	92	84	0	0	0	0	250
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	136	164	141	0	0	0	0	441

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	173	205	195	0	0	0	0	573

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	6	1	46	0	0	0	0	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	11	0	0	0	0	20

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	33%	40%	50%				38%	48%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	39%						46%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	29%						46%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	36%	34%	36%				43%	50%	58%
Math Learning Gains	45%						51%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						52%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	40%	53%				42%	44%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	61%	49%	58%				83%	72%	72%

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
06	2022					
	2019	41%	48%	-7%	54%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	32%	42%	-10%	52%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
08	2022					
	2019	42%	48%	-6%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

	MATH					
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	38%	47%	-9%	55%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	33%	39%	-6%	54%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
08	2022					
	2019	37%	35%	2%	46%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

	SCIENCE					
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	42%	41%	1%	48%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	83%	70%	13%	71%	12%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	81%	50%	31%	61%	20%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%

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	15	29	21	16	38	39	27	33	60		
ELL	18	34	40	27	42	56	13	48			
BLK	27	36	22	25	42	38	25	48	81		
HSP	31	40	39	36	48	53	26	63	69		
MUL	33	24		22	53						
WHT	38	40	31	42	45	41	49	63	72		
FRL	29	38	29	32	45	45	30	53	74		
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	13	27	27	12	25	29	16	36			
ELL	20	47	53	22	28	23	11	31			
ASN	40	60		50	60						

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
BLK	24	32	25	16	27	30	18	46	53		
HSP	36	44	46	31	31	26	30	48	67		
MUL	40	50		30	20						
WHT	39	39	35	39	30	23	42	64	75		
FRL	30	36	34	24	27	24	31	50	65		
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	38	41	23	50	50	20	61			
ELL	10	40	38	26	46	52	17	67			
BLK	30	50	58	24	46	46	29	72	53		
HSP	42	49	40	44	53	51	47	82	72		
MUL	59	44		59	41						
WHT	38	42	41	50	53	58	44	88	73		
FRL	35	47	47	37	49	52	39	81	69		

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	434
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
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	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	33
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	47
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	41
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?

Our SWD and ELL students continue to underperform in ELA and Math. These are our ESSA subgroups that are not meeting federal guidelines. Our ELA cells under the state accountability guidelines all decreased during the 21-22 school year. All other accountability cells increased. However, we continue to lag behind state averages in most of our cells.

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

We continue to trend down in our ELA accountability cells (proficiency, learning gains and learning gains of bottom 25%. Our ESSA subgroups, SWD and ELL, continue to underperform.

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 are teacher and student attendance and lack of rigorous and ambitious instruction. We will focus in Standards Based Instruction providing students with equitable opportunities related to standards and benchmarks. We will also focus on positive culture and environment related to staff and students.

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

All 3 components of the school accountability chart related to Math improved significantly. We are improved in Science and Civics proficiency.

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

Provided additional supports in classrooms that had our most critical need students (bottom 25%, ESE, ELL etc.). Tutoring provided that focused on specific student needs. We also used RTD (response to data) groups over a 12 week period that focused on students that we could move in learning gains.

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

Continue to monitor individual student historical data to make sure student is placed in the correct classes. Data chats will be utilized to show students their progress on assessments and expectations that will be placed on them during the year. Enrichment activities will be planned to continue to push high achieving 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.

We will begin teaching B.E.S.T. standards in Math and ELA. All other subject areas will we continue to follow standards set forth by the state of Florida. We will work with teachers to enrich students learning once skills are mastered in order for students to take their learning to a higher level.

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

We will plan instruction with the Learning Arc tool that focuses on Standards Based Instruction. We will also monitor the work students are working on in class through a walk through tool that focuses on the actual work students are doing. The focus is on the student work only and if it is at the level of the intent of the standard.

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.**	Data from FSA and STAR shows that our students are losing in proficiency in ELA and Math.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	School data based on state assessments will show a +3% proficiency increase for all content as well as 10% of the students just below the proficiency line becoming proficient.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Progress monitoring data offered by district level assessment platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1. Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using SWT (Standards Walk-through Tool) 2. Engaged teachers in standards based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	TNTP's The Opportunity Myth speaks to the relationship between academic success and ensuring students are able to engage in grade level standards based expectations. It is imperative we both monitor for aligned and planned for teachers understanding of the benchmarks and aligned tasks and assessments.

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 SWT Tool
Create a calendar for leadership calibration walks

Person Responsible	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)

Strategy SWT Tool
Train leadership team on SWT tool in first 2 calibration walks

Person Responsible	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)

Strategy SWT Tool
Conduct calibration walks until the team shows 90-100% calibration consistently with rationale.

Person Responsible	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)

Strategy SWT Tool
Add SWT data review to administration meeting agenda.

Person Responsible	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)

Strategy SWT Tool
Establish protocol to review SWT data. This will be done weekly/bi-weekly.

Person Responsible	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)

Strategy SWT Tool
Monitor impact between SWT review data and planning per content/course.

Person Responsible	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)

Learning Arc
Master schedule that includes collaborative planning

Person Responsible	Katie Shytle (katie.shytle@polk-fl.net)

Learning Arc
Assign and train planning facilitators

Person Responsible	Katie Shytle (katie.shytle@polk-fl.net)

Learning Arc
Add planning results findings to administration meeting agenda

Person Responsible	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)

Learning Arc
Conduct weekly planning using protocol

Person Responsible	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)

Learning Arc
Review planning findings during administration meeting

Person Responsible	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)

Learning Arc
Conduct correlation analysis between SWT findings and benchmarks planned for using the Learning Arc

Person Responsible	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to teacher and staff behaviors.	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Teacher and staff attendance showed that 81% of the staff missed 16+ days during the 21-22 school year.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	During the 22-23 school year teacher/staff attendance will improve by 31%. Meaning that 50% or less of the staff/ teachers will be absent 15 days or less.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Teacher attendance will be monitored through the district Inzata platform.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1. Montlhy incentives for teachers and staff that meet attendance goals, based on a tiered system. - perfect attendance - no more than 1 day absent
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Research from leading universities shows that teacher/staff absences has detrimental effects on student achievement especially in schools with high poverty, such as Bartow Middle School.

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.

Run monthly absentee report from FOCUS

Person Responsible	Katie Shytle (katie.shytle@polk-fl.net)

Identifiy and recognize staff that has met attendance goal.

Person Responsible	Dwayne Johnson (dwayne.johnson@polk-fl.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student behavior.	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Student attendance data showed that 57% of students missed 10+ days during the 21-22 school year.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	During the 22-23 school year student attendance will improve by 12%. Meaning that 45% or less of the students will be absent 9 days or less.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Student attendance will be monitored through the district Inzata platform and Focus attendance reports.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1. Incentives for students that meet attendance goals, based on a tiered system. - perfect attendance - 1-2 days absent per quarter
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	According to ed.gov student absenteeism has detrimental effects on student achievement especially in schools with high poverty. Student attendance is a greater predictor of whether students will drop out before graduation, than test scores.

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.

Run attendance reports from the district platform FOCUS.

Person Responsible	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)

Identify students more than 2 absences for the month.

Person Responsible	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)

Notify students that have 2+ absences per month via district platform.

Person Responsible	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)

Students with 5+ days will receive a district generated district letter.

Person Responsible	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)

Students with 10+ days of absences in a semester will referred for attendance meeting with the school social worker and/or truant officer.

Person Responsible	Christopher Roberts (christopher.roberts@polk-fl.net)

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 Middle School leadership team will intentionally engage students and staff in Servant Leadership Principles to ensure that students and staff receive an equitable school experience. Through the principles describe by Robert K. Greenleaf, BMS leadership team will build authentic and meaningful relationships with students and staff. We will deploy listening skill to ensure all stakeholders are heard, empathy to demonstrate our understanding of how they fill, healing strategies that encompass the whole individual and collective school body, self-awareness to ensure that as a leadership team that we are always aware of the impact of our decisions and building a community that honors and values the work that each individual brings to the table.

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

The simple answer is that it is all of our jobs to promote positive culture and environment. This is a nonnegotiable with our staff. Students, parents, volunteers, community members are all expected to assist us in
building our future.
Students- attend school daily, come to school prepared to learn and engage in academic task, interact appropriately with their peers and adults.
Parents- will send their student to school daily prepared to work and engage in academic tasks. Will support the school in matters related to academics and behavior. Will participate in family involvement activities provided by the school.
Staff- attend work daily. Have lessons that are related to the task, standards based, and engaging to all students. Will use technology that is available to them to enhance learning opportunities for all students. Will nurture and support all students. Will continue to grow professionally and master their craft.
Volunteers- will support the school in areas of need such as shelfing books in media center, making copies for teachers, being on the school SAC, assisting teachers with small groups, mentoring.
Community members- support extracurricular activities in the community through financial assistance, donations, or general support by being present at important events.
Continue our partnerships with our feeder elementary schools and our high school.