

Manatee County Public Schools

# Bayshore High School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Bayshore High School

5401 34TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34210

<https://www.manateeschools.net/bayshore>

## Demographics

**Principal: Wendell Butler**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: C (44%)<br>2018-19: C (47%)<br>2017-18: C (51%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TSI  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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](http://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

---

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

## Bayshore High School

5401 34TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34210

<https://www.manateeschools.net/bayshore>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School<br>9-12                              | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 81%  |

### 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 Manatee 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.

To provide to all students an education which prepares them to be college and career ready by engaging them in rigorous academic work that promotes student achievement.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Creating personalized educational experiences and developing productive life-long learners contributing to a global and technological society.

### 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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Butler, Wendell     | Principal           |                                 |
| Carlson, Dorlinda   | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Gehlot, Allison     | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| French, Donald      | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Wilson, Robert      | Graduation Coach    |                                 |
| Distelhurst, Andrea |                     |                                 |
| Lamar, Amber        | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Polly, Gary         | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Sancho, Gretta      | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Poyner, Chrissy     | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Wendell Butler

**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.*

4

**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.*

14

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

82

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,431

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

14

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

14

**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 | 341 | 356 | 279 | 286 | 1262 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 195 | 167 | 140 | 667  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71  | 90  | 40  | 31  | 232  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 113 | 98  | 104 | 469  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 224 | 69  | 38  | 502  |       |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 | 164 | 147 | 100 | 563  |       |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 28  | 149 | 117 | 420  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 | 164 | 146 | 100 | 562  |       |

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 | 87 | 88 | 61 | 55 | 291 |       |

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**

Tuesday 9/6/2022



**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 | 383 | 386 | 302 | 304 | 1375  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 298 | 299 | 217 | 226 | 1040  |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7   | 6   | 8   | 3   | 24    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40  | 92  | 66  | 61  | 259   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56  | 107 | 69  | 19  | 251   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 158 | 88  | 91  | 455   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 107 | 100 | 9   | 324   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 160 | 105 | 101 | 511   |

**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 | 158 | 155 | 117 | 126 | 556   |

**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 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| 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                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 383 | 386 | 302 | 304 | 1375  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 298 | 299 | 217 | 226 | 1040  |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7   | 6   | 8   | 3   | 24    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40  | 92  | 66  | 61  | 259   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56  | 107 | 69  | 19  | 251   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 158 | 88  | 91  | 455   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 107 | 100 | 9   | 324   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 160 | 105 | 101 | 511   |

#### 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 | 158 | 155 | 117 | 126 | 556   |

#### 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 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| 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             | 29%    | 48%      | 51%   |        |          |       | 32%    | 49%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 43%    |          |       |        |          |       | 44%    | 47%      | 51%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 37%    |          |       |        |          |       | 40%    | 37%      | 42%   |
| Math Achievement            | 32%    | 35%      | 38%   |        |          |       | 39%    | 51%      | 51%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 37%    |          |       |        |          |       | 48%    | 47%      | 48%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 37%    |          |       |        |          |       | 45%    | 45%      | 45%   |
| Science Achievement         | 41%    | 45%      | 40%   |        |          |       | 41%    | 67%      | 68%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 44%    | 43%      | 48%   |        |          |       | 56%    | 69%      | 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         | 40%    | 69%      | -29%                  | 67%   | -27%               |
| 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         | 55%    | 71%      | -16%                  | 70%   | -15%               |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 34%    | 65%      | -31%                  | 61%   | -27%               |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 41%    | 61%      | -20%                  | 57%   | -16%               |

## 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                                       | 10       | 38     | 35          | 14        | 44      | 39           | 17       | 16      |           | 79                | 5                   |
| ELL                                       | 8        | 33     | 33          | 22        | 33      | 38           | 22       | 16      |           | 70                | 38                  |
| BLK                                       | 22       | 42     | 35          | 20        | 31      | 35           | 56       | 24      |           | 85                | 68                  |
| HSP                                       | 25       | 39     | 32          | 30        | 34      | 38           | 34       | 39      |           | 82                | 54                  |
| MUL                                       | 48       | 52     |             | 42        | 42      |              | 25       | 70      |           | 91                | 70                  |
| WHT                                       | 42       | 52     | 69          | 46        | 55      |              | 56       | 60      |           | 69                | 64                  |
| FRL                                       | 27       | 43     | 40          | 31        | 36      | 42           | 40       | 44      |           | 78                | 57                  |
| 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                                       | 8        | 21     | 18          | 8         | 14      | 21           | 20       | 18      |           | 86                | 17                  |
| ELL                                       | 9        | 31     | 35          | 9         | 18      | 26           | 12       | 15      |           | 78                | 17                  |
| BLK                                       | 12       | 22     | 19          | 11        | 21      | 27           | 19       | 23      |           | 86                | 25                  |
| HSP                                       | 24       | 33     | 29          | 16        | 22      | 37           | 24       | 41      |           | 80                | 29                  |
| MUL                                       | 45       | 25     |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 76                | 38                  |
| WHT                                       | 43       | 44     | 12          | 26        | 19      |              | 52       | 67      |           | 78                | 38                  |
| FRL                                       | 24       | 32     | 25          | 18        | 23      | 36           | 30       | 47      |           | 79                | 30                  |
| 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                                       | 11       | 32     | 32          | 16        | 20      |              | 18       | 34      |           | 85                | 9                   |
| ELL                                       | 8        | 35     | 40          | 25        | 45      | 43           | 22       | 26      |           | 50                | 45                  |
| BLK                                       | 22       | 43     | 43          | 28        | 37      | 31           | 32       | 36      |           | 75                | 37                  |
| HSP                                       | 27       | 40     | 36          | 37        | 47      | 51           | 35       | 50      |           | 77                | 46                  |
| MUL                                       | 56       | 47     |             | 52        |         |              | 45       | 86      |           | 82                | 36                  |
| WHT                                       | 44       | 51     | 52          | 48        | 56      | 47           | 58       | 76      |           | 83                | 46                  |
| FRL                                       | 28       | 41     | 38          | 38        | 45      | 39           | 42       | 53      |           | 80                | 45                  |

## 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)  | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 44  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 2   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 43  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 483 |

| ESSA Federal Index   |     |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 11  |
| Percent Tested   | 96% |
| Subgroup Data  |     |
| Students With Disabilities   |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 30  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 3   |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 32  |
| 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   |     |
| 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                                | 42  |
| 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  | 41  |
| 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   | 55  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |

| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| 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   | 57  |
| 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                                | 43  |
| 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?

All FSA scores trended down when comparing them to the 2019 assessment year. Our second quarter benchmarks, which are usually predictive of FSA scores, were not predictive either. However, when reviewing the data of 21-22 to that of 20-21, students showed elements of rebounding after 2 years of learning loss.

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

The greatest need for improvement based on progress monitoring is math, science, English, and graduation rate. In addition, our Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners subgroups need to improve.

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

Covid and its related absences were a contributing factor to the very low scores in our progress monitoring. Students were not motivated to do well in school as they were occupied with helping their families provide a home and food.

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

Our acceleration rate improved dramatically.

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

Utilization of our AICE General Paper Course for all seniors, expansion of our Cyber Security Courses and refinement in our Construction Program gave students the ability to participate and perform well on accelerated assessments.

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

BHS is implementing the CHAMPS school and classroom management system in all classes to establish routines, procedures, etc., that support engagement and learning. We have implemented a new writing program in NoRedInk. We have expanded our after school tutoring options, plan to continue our additional new teacher trainings, and have purchased Study Island and USA TestPrep for additional student support.

**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.**

AVID training is provided all teachers during the summer. We have additional AVID training throughout the year.

BHS' new teachers are being supported by additional training in classroom management, ESE accommodations, WIDA, interactive word walls and vocabulary.

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

We have tutoring four days a week. We have ESOL tutoring provided will be available four days a week to support academics and graduation requirements. In addition it will be used to support those students who can use a portfolio for graduation. Our ESOL students have tiered Developmental English classes, tiered ESOL English classes, and tiered ESOL for Reading classes. Our ESE students are supported as required in their IEPs to include Peers as Partners, Tutorology (AVID) training, and for those that require it, self-contained classrooms.

**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 ELA**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description**  
**and Rationale:**  
**Include a**  
**rationale that**  
**explains how**  
**it was**  
**identified as a**  
**critical need**  
**from the data**  
**reviewed.**

Our school reading achievement data increased two percentage points to 29% from 2020-21. However, looking at a 3yr comparison, we are down 3% point from the 2019 assessment year.

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

BHS' goal is to raise ELA achievement by 5% to 34%. Use of data from PM1 in September, Benchmark data in October and PM2 in February will help us monitor student progress. PM2 in May 2023 will provide us a summative report of student growth for the school year.

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

BHS will monitor this through school, district, and state progress monitoring. We will use common assessments during Q1, Q2, and Q3 to drive instruction. We believe data provided via Lexia PowerUp and PM1 & PM2, will provided us an accurate snapshot of student performance and allow us to provide necessary remedial or enrichment support to help them achieve the targeted goal.

We are also having all teachers work with PEARL with students to ensure they know how to write a body paragraph supported by evidence. ELA teachers will focus on intro and conclusion and introducing students to narrative writing.

**Person**  
**responsible**  
**for monitoring**  
**outcome:**

Dorlinda Carlson (carlsonl@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-**  
**based**  
**Strategy:**  
**Describe the**  
**evidence-**  
**based strategy**  
**being**  
**implemented**  
**for this Area**  
**of Focus.**

Teachers will be using AVID strategies to engage students in the learning. They will use CHAMPS strategies to help develop relationships with the students. Students will be taught to write across the curriculum. They will write more than they have in the past, supported by a number of different teachers. Students are also using Lexia Power Up, one of the two programs recommended by the state to support students and their writing will be supported by NoRedInk. We are also asking that teachers use Interactive Word Walls and support their students vocabulary needs through interaction with the words in the unit through their boards and through Vocabulary.com.

**Rationale for**  
**Evidence-**  
**based**

Our Reading scores are low across the board, not just in one area. As a result, we are encouraging and practicing in all areas. Lexia Power Up was chosen because our students are bored with Reading Plus and their scores have been going down, not up. It



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

is also one of the two programs approved by the state for the Best Standards being implemented this year.

### 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.

AVID training and modeling for existing staff and new teachers.

**Person Responsible** Robert Wilson (wilsonr@manateeschools.net)

Lexia Power-Up training for reading teachers

**Person Responsible** Dorlinda Carlson (carlsonl@manateeschools.net)

Assign and monitor PEARL Paragraphs from the staff.

**Person Responsible** Dorlinda Carlson (carlsonl@manateeschools.net)

Introduce and monitor Interactive Word Walls and Vocabulary.com

**Person Responsible** Dorlinda Carlson (carlsonl@manateeschools.net)

English will use state progress monitoring and will analyze the data looking for opportunities to reteach.

**Person Responsible** Dorlinda Carlson (carlsonl@manateeschools.net)

English will use common planning throughout the quarter and will have a complete day of common planning at least once a quarter.

**Person Responsible** Amber Lamar (lamara@manateeschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus  
Description and****Rationale:**

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

Our school math achievement data increased by 14% to 32% from 2020 to 2021. However, looking at the 3yr comparison data, our achievement decreased by 7% from the 2019 assessment.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

Our goal is to increase math achievement by 3% to 35% for both the Algebra 1 and Geometry assessment. Use of Benchmark data in October and December and summative data from FSA Math scores in May of 2023 will provide us insight into student growth for the 22-23 school year.

**Monitoring:**

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

BHS will monitor math through district progress monitoring. We believe that the 2nd quarter benchmark will return to normal and be predictive this year. In addition, we will progress monitor through ALEKS (Alg 1B) and Acaletics for Alg 1A/Foundational Skills in Math. As we evaluate our data, we will be reviewing the scores for our ESOL students and ESE students and addressing their needs for different learning strategies and reteaching.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Allison Gehlot (gehlota@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

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

Math is using AVID and Kagan instructional Strategies to engage students in the learning. They will use CHAMPS strategies to help develop relationships with the students. Alg 1A and Foundational Skills in Math are using a paper based program called Acaletics. In addition, the district is allowing us to continue our affiliation with Renee Wittenbrook. She is working with our new teachers on best practices for teaching math and using manipulatives.

**Rationale for  
Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Our progress monitoring scores were not indicative of our students performance on the state assessment. As a result, we are keeping a close eye on grades and targeting students who are not making adequate progress. We are also using reinforcing programs such as Acaletics and ALEKS. We also have after-school tutoring four days a week to support math areas of Alg. 1 and Geometry and also SAT/ACT.

**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.

Existing and new teachers will be AVID trained.

**Person Responsible** Robert Wilson (wilsonr@manateeschools.net)

Teachers will be trained on ALEKS or Acaletics depending on what they teach.

**Person Responsible** Allison Gehlot (gehlota@manateeschools.net)

New teachers will be trained by district personnel as to research-based methods of teaching math.

**Person Responsible** Allison Gehlot (gehlota@manateeschools.net)

Math will use the district progress monitoring and will analyze the data for opportunities to reteach.

**Person Responsible** Allison Gehlot (gehlota@manateeschools.net)

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

**Area of Focus**  
**Description**  
**and Rationale:**  
**Include a**  
**rationale that**  
**explains how**  
**it was**  
**identified as a**  
**critical need**  
**from the data**  
**reviewed.**

Our school Biology achievement data increased by 10% to 41% from 2020 to 2021. However, looking at the 3yr comparison data, our achievement remained the same at 41% from the 2019 assessment.

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

BHS' goal is to increase Biology achievement by 4% to 45%. Benchmark and EOC data in May 2023 will provide a snapshot into student growth for the 22-23 school year.

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

BHS will use district progress monitoring Q1 and S1. We believe that the 1st semester benchmark will return to normal and be predictive this year. .We are having teachers work with PEARL with students to ensure students can support their findings with evidence. In addition, BHS will use vocabulary.com to monitor science vocabulary acquisition. As we evaluate our data, we will be reviewing the scores for our African American students, our ESOL students, and our ESE students and addressing their needs for different learning strategies and reteaching.

**Person**  
**responsible**  
**for monitoring**  
**outcome:**

Allison Gehlot (gehlota@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-**  
**based**  
**Strategy:**  
**Describe the**  
**evidence-**  
**based**  
**strategy being**  
**implemented**  
**for this Area**  
**of Focus.**

Teachers will be using AVID strategies to engage students in the learning. They will use CHAMPS strategies to help develop relationships with the students. Students will be taught to write paragraphs supported by evidence. Science teachers are using interactive word walls and supporting vocabulary needs through interaction with the words in the unit through their word walls and through Vocabulary.com. Teachers and students also have access to Study Island to practice answering Biology questions online.

**Rationale for**  
**Evidence-**  
**based**  
**Strategy:**

AVID supports student engagement which we struggle with in content areas. We are using CHAMPS strategies to help develop close relationships between students and teachers. Writing PEARL paragraphs helps students understand how evidence is supposed to support conclusions, a connection with which students also struggle.

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

interactive word walls will force students to use the unit vocabulary and help them draw connections between the words and the concepts the teacher is presenting. Vocabulary.com is for rote memory. Study Island will be used for students to practice test taking online and reading the question being asked instead of guessing the question.

### **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.

All existing and new teachers will be AVID trained.

**Person Responsible** Robert Wilson (wilsonr@manateeschools.net)

Science teachers will be taught the PEARL paragraph method and will be assigned to teach and turn in one set of student PEARL samples per month.

**Person Responsible** Amber Lamar (lamara@manateeschools.net)

Teachers will develop an Interactive Word Wall in science and update it by concept or unit. They will also use Vocabulary.com to support student memorization.

**Person Responsible** Andrea Distelhurst (distelhursta@manateeschools.net)

Science will use the progress monitoring assessments and analyze the data for reteaching opportunities.

**Person Responsible** Allison Gehlot (gehlota@manateeschools.net)

**#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance****Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:****Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Attendance among our student population, especially our most vulnerable students has been in constant flux and recently trends in a negative direction. Inconsistent attendance greatly affects academic achievement for all students and disrupts our learning environment and school climate.

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

Reduction of chronic absenteeism among our most vulnerable students and subgroups by 5%. Increase in average daily attendance rate to 90%.

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

An attendance team will be created of at least 4 members who will meet every three weeks to review chronic absence data. Data will be disaggregated for individuals and groups of students with unexcused and excused absences and days missed related to suspensions.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Wendell Butler (butlerw@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:  
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Share monthly attendance data with school staff and community via student/parent portal, staff reviews, school report cards, newsletters and wall displays. Develop partnerships with community and parents to recognize good and improved attendance. Monitor students who are on the cusp of tier 2 or tier 3, identify common barriers, emerging patterns, and identify the causes for chronic attendance issues and facilitate problem solving approaches to address student needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:  
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**

This approach allows the school to have a positive impact on school climate by consistently making parents aware of the importance of attendance and indirectly asking them to partner in making sure their student attends consistently. In addition, positive support and praise will aid in increasing the likelihood that students will attend due to incentives provided. Furthermore, proactively problem-solving students identified as chronically absent will allow us to provide better case management of our student needs, develop more effective prevention, early, and intensive interventions to combat the reasons for absences.

**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.

1. Establish attendance team members
2. Look at team purpose and determine focus and desired outcome
3. Define the roles and responsibilities of all
4. Set up meeting frequency
5. Develop norms, data reports, and agendas for meeting (Protocols)
6. Determine the type of data needed
7. Identify current school climate and culture related to attendance
8. Identify Tier 1, 2, & 3 needs.
9. Develop initial plan of attack and solidify incentives or recognition method for students.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Wendell Butler (butlerw@manateeschools.net)

### **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.**

We have begun using CHAMPS/SPARK in every classroom. Use of CHAMPS Protocols and our instructional expectations of a welcoming ritual at the beginning of each lesson, an engaging strategy, and an optimistic close at the end of each lesson, will help teacher create an environment welcoming for learning.

The hope is that students will form stronger relationships with their teachers and with each other. The byproduct of these relationships is more engagement, more productivity, better attendance, and a higher graduation rate.

We are also using the district's plan for five hours of mental health lessons on specific topics for each grade level as assigned by the district. Students have been suffering a great deal through the COVID crisis, and we see higher numbers of referrals to agencies in the community.

We will send out teachers to mental health training and recertify our teachers as needed by the district.

We are also doing attendance and grade point average incentives for students and also high score incentives in reading classes.

In addition, our chorus teacher is piloting a Celebration in Culture through Music focus in her class. The goal is to create an inviting space for students to share their cultural differences and support each other as they explore music.

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

Principal - sets the tone of the school

Asst. Principals - follow the lead of the principal, encourages the staff while holding them accountable for instructional practices

Lead teachers - responsible for upholding instructional practices, leading their staff to have high standards.

Deans monitor and support CHAMPS initiative

Teachers - responsible for delivering quality instruction, CHAMPS protocols, and encouraging students to improve school culture

Support Staff - responsible for supporting instruction and encouraging students

Students - responsible for learning and Learning and responding to adhering to CHAMPS expectations in all classes.