

Polk County Public Schools

# Berkley Accelerated



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>  |

## Berkley Accelerated

5316 BERKLEY RD, Auburndale, FL 33823

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/bams>

### Demographics

**Principal: Jill Bolender**

Start Date for this Principal: 4/1/2004

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>6-10  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 41%   |
| <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>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: A (68%)<br>2018-19: A (70%)<br>2017-18: A (66%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   |   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## School Board Approval

N/A

## 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>  |

## Berkley Accelerated

5316 BERKLEY RD, Auburndale, FL 33823

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/bams>

### 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) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School<br>6-10                       | No                     | 41%  |
| 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                           | Yes                    | 33%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A       |         | A       | A       |

### School Board Approval

N/A

### 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.

BAMS is committed to inspiring our students to Believe in Better, to encourage them to aspire to higher learning, and challenge them to achieve their maximum individual potential while providing a supportive and safe educational environment.

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

"Believe in BETTER!"

### 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 |
|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Bolender, Jill | Principal           |                                 |
| Sawyer, Brian  | Other               |                                 |
| Walker, Loren  | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Figueroa, Ana  | Other               |                                 |
| Tapp, Carrie   | School Counselor    |                                 |
| Wilson, Ashley | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 4/1/2004, Jill Bolender

**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.*

6

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

34

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

623

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

5

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

6

## 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 | 164 | 158 | 162 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 484   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20  | 21  | 37  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 78    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12  | 12  | 8   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11  | 16  | 10  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 37    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6   | 16  | 10  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22  | 18  | 20  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 60    |

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 | 6 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |

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

Monday 9/26/2022

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 | 164 | 160 | 153 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 477   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31  | 19  | 34  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 84    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9   | 20  | 14  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 43    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 2   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10  | 10  | 12  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4   | 2   | 8   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3   | 2   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

**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 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |

**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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |

**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 | 164 | 160 | 153 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 477   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31  | 19  | 34  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 84    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9   | 20  | 14  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 43    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 2   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10  | 10  | 12  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4   | 2   | 8   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3   | 2   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

**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 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |

**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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |

**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             | 70%    | 51%      | 55%   |        |          |       | 74%    | 61%      | 61%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 59%    |          |       |        |          |       | 71%    | 58%      | 59%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 37%    |          |       |        |          |       | 59%    | 49%      | 54%   |
| Math Achievement            | 78%    | 37%      | 42%   |        |          |       | 86%    | 61%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 68%    |          |       |        |          |       | 63%    | 56%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 63%    |          |       |        |          |       | 57%    | 52%      | 52%   |
| Science Achievement         | 76%    | 48%      | 54%   |        |          |       | 65%    | 52%      | 56%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 81%    | 53%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 87%    | 79%      | 78%   |

**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 | 69%    | 48%      | 21%                        | 54%   | 15%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 79%    | 42%      | 37%                        | 52%   | 27%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -69%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 75%    | 48%      | 27%                        | 56%   | 19%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -79%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 91%    | 47%      | 44%                        | 55%   | 36%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 75%    | 39%      | 36%                        | 54%   | 21%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -91%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 73%    | 35%      | 38%                        | 46%   | 27%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -75%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 65%    | 41%      | 24%                        | 48%   | 17%                     |
| 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        | 87%    | 70%      | 17%                   | 71%   | 16%                |
| 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         | 99%    | 50%      | 49%                   | 61%   | 38%                |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 96%    | 53%      | 43%                   | 57%   | 39%                |

### 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                                       | 19       | 39     | 40          | 48        | 68      | 63           | 20       | 38      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 48       | 72     | 71          | 64        | 80      | 69           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 73       | 50     |             | 77        | 65      |              |          | 82      | 90        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 72       | 67     | 46          | 76        | 72      | 53           | 76       | 80      | 74        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 68       | 56     | 34          | 79        | 66      | 68           | 75       | 81      | 82        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 63       | 59     | 33          | 73        | 71      | 62           | 67       | 75      | 79        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 14       | 36     | 35          | 18        | 18      | 13           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 57       | 73     | 77          | 46        | 46      | 36           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 92       | 83     |             | 100       | 42      |              |          |         | 80        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 72       | 84     | 82          | 56        | 45      | 43           | 50       |         | 42        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 78       | 79     | 74          | 64        | 40      | 25           | 68       | 79      | 53        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 54       | 62     |             | 58        | 42      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 72       | 68     | 47          | 72        | 44      | 31           | 67       | 86      | 55        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 68       | 68     | 54          | 59        | 41      | 29           | 57       | 81      | 41        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 22       | 56     | 50          | 39        | 33      | 9            |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 75       | 75     |             | 58        | 54      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 94       | 76     |             | 100       | 76      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 55       | 61     | 57          | 76        | 64      | 53           | 42       | 55      | 45        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 79       | 76     | 68          | 81        | 68      | 50           | 63       | 87      | 60        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 63       | 44     |             | 81        | 69      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 74       | 72     | 60          | 88        | 60      | 57           | 66       | 89      | 67        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 66       | 65     | 60          | 82        | 65      | 52           | 54       | 80      | 52        |                   |                     |

### 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)  | N/A  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 70   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 82   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 695  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 42   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 69   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |
| 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                                 | 73   |
| 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  | 71  |
| 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   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | N/A |
| 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   | 68  |
| 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                                | 65  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The trends that emerge across grade levels include our lowest 25% ELA gains. Our ESE population as with our lowest 25% did not see significant learning gains in the content area of ELA across all three grade levels.

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

The low ELA data trends from our FSA assessment show the need for additional support for ELA and Reading. In addition, the lowest 25% subgroup being significantly low showed the need for collaborative learning initiatives to be more apparent in the upcoming school year.

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

The contributing factors to this need for improvement would be a change in ELA/Reading teachers mid-year as well as the lack of collaborative learning due to prior COVID restrictions.

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

The Math component and the lowest 25% population showed a significant increase from previous years. The Math lowest 25% area was a struggle and one of our goals on last year's school improvement plan.

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

The contributing factors to success in the Math department included an Intensive Math class addition for those students who scored below a 2. One of our admin team added as a Math coach for teaching, planning, and monitoring of data. In addition, teachers added collaborative learning techniques and online resources/programs designed for drill and practice.

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

Additional collaborative learning strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning. Kagan's collaborative learning focus in each classroom.

**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.**

Every new teacher attends a week-long Kagan training over the summer. The administration has developed a plan where teachers are collaborating together and teaching other staff members of Kagan strategies. Professional development will also be provided in Reading strategies, CLOSE and CLOZE.

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

The addition of the Math intensive class is a permanent fixture in students' schedules who scored a 1 in Math. In addition, an intensive Reading class is on the schedule for all students in grades 6-10 that scored a 1 in Reading. Weekly grade level meetings occur where team members collaborate on CLOSE reading strategies used within the week.

**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.

Outcomes from state assessments identify a need for improvement in ELA from the lowest 25%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

State data will show an increase in learning gains in the lowest 25% subgroup for ELA to at least 40%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Progress Monitoring data offered by F.A.S.T. assessments will be used to ensure students are mastering benchmarks, being taught after planning is properly implemented.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Loren Walker (loren.walker@berkleymiddle.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Monitor students engaging in equivalent reading experiences aligned to state expectations using iObservations. Engage teachers in standards based planning protocol using the Marzano Lesson Framework and engagement strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Deficiencies in the lowest 25% in ELA will be addressed by engaging teachers in standard based planning using research based strategies such as the Marzano lesson framework and Kagan Collaborative strategies using graphic organizers.

**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. Create calendar of progress monitoring dates to enhance importance of student growth.
2. Monitor items discussed during grade level team meetings weekly.
3. Conduct walkthroughs using iObservation until team demonstrates 100% highly effective use of engagement strategies.
4. Review and collaborate post progress monitoring benchmark results from F.A.S.T. and iObservation walkthrough data.
5. Establish a protocol to review the effective use of Reading engagement strategies through the Lesson plan folder.
6. Monitor impact between data review from F.A.S.T and iObservation and planning for highly effective engagement strategies using the Marzano framework.

**Person Responsible**

Loren Walker (loren.walker@berkleymiddle.net)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement****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 iObservation walkthroughs show an trend of teachers not utilizing Kagan or other engagement strategies appropriately.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

iObservation evaluation data will show an increase in engagement strategies during instructional planning, delivery, and student performance tasks by at least 100% of the staff.

**Monitoring:**

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

iObservation walkthroughs and lesson plans will be used to ensure teachers are appropriately implementing the domains on the Marzano Framework and structures found in Kagan collaborative strategies.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jill Bolender (jill.bolender@berkleymiddle.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

1. Monitor students engaging in equivalent rigorous and engaging experiences aligned to state expectations using iObservations.
2. Engage teachers in standards based planning protocol using the Marzano Lesson Framework and engagement strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Marzano Lesson Framework is researched based highly effective teaching strategies that encompasses a lot of collaborative, rigorous, and engaging lessons. Kagan collaborative learning is a proven method of successful collaboration as well.

**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. Add to staff calendar: leadership modeling and teacher led exemplar use of Kagan collaborative structures.
2. Monitor engagement strategies and activities discussed during grade level team meetings weekly.
3. Conduct walkthroughs using iObservation until team demonstrates 100% highly effective use of Marzano/Kagan engagement strategies.
4. Review and collaborate post progress monitoring benchmark results from F.A.S.T. and iObservation walkthrough data.
5. Establish a protocol to review the effective use of Kagan/Marzano Reading engagement strategies through the Lesson Plan folder.
6. Monitor impact between data review from F.A.S.T. and iObservation and planning for highly effective engagement strategies using the Marzano Framework and Kagan Collaborative strategies.

**Person Responsible**

Jill Bolender (jill.bolender@berkleymiddle.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.

Annually, incoming families are provided a BAMily email address and expectations for an exceptional school year. Each BAMily receives individualized information and expectations for success.

Lesson plans with mindfulness and brain breaks built in.

YMHFA training to detect, monitor, and provide intervention strategies that connect them to community service providers.

Marzano Instructional Framework

Board members involved in school activities

Colorful, bright, inviting, purposefully designed 21st century classrooms

Conscious learning to provide student choice

Individual teacher talents utilized to meet student interests to mutually engage students and staff

Teachers serve as coaches for community sports teams and extracurricular after-school activities.

Kagan collaborative strategies for student engagement and participation-learning about each other's interests and cultures.

Local businesses support hosting events such as Veterans Day celebrations and sleepovers.

Parent, staff, and student surveys

Kindness wall designed and painted by parent

Kindness message communicated throughout the community by small businesses, school uniforms, website, email

Parent, staff, and student surveys

Frequent Parent volunteers for dances, spring fling, celebrations

Professional learning committees school-wide departments/teams designed for student success that follow the instructional framework.

BAMS utilizes a robust communication plan.

Teacher talents to build relationships and connect with students outside classroom walls

School "BAMily" emails for all families

Notify Parents of emergencies, changes to normal operations through BAMily emails, Remind text notifications, and social media platforms

Welcome incoming students and families tours and open house nights.

Help students and families know about the upcoming school year.

Inform families of Orientation date/time.

Keep students and informed of ongoing activities.

Inform families of policies and rules.

Facilitate easy location of school information.

Inform students and parents of class objectives.

Communicate student-specific concerns with a parent.

Personal interaction for answering parent questions about school.

\*After School Clubs

\*We are BAMily slogan

Facilitate easy location of school information.

Inform students and parents of class objectives.

Open House for all families.

Communicate student-specific concerns with a parent.

Personal interaction for answering parent questions about school.

Attain opinions of stakeholders through surveys that are used as data for the Parent Advisory Committee.

Promote school mission and goals of school through print, social media, email, clothing, and events that focus on the growth mindset, and character education

\*Strength and Conditioning Period

\*Character Counts Education

\*Love and Logic

\*School-wide Positive Behavior Support "BAMS Bucks"

\*Be Kind. initiative

\*Rachel's Challenge activities

\*Athletic Program

\*After School Clubs

\*Mentors

\*Guidance Services

\*Threat assessment interventions

BAMS employs various strategies to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in the transition from one school level to another. Orientation meetings are held in the summer for incoming students and their parents. At this meeting, the administrative team, Guidance Department and Leadership Team share information and expectations for Middle School success. Families engage in activities around the school campus to become familiar with the school and staff.

Additionally, at the beginning of the school year counselors host 8th-grade students and parents to discuss high school requirements and credit course histories (Advanced Courses, Virtual Course Completions, Program availability, and Timelines for applications to various programs available). Furthermore, the school also hosts various articulation events and activities throughout the course of the year to support the secondary transition.

The school-based MTSS/Rtl Leadership Team consists of the Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor, ESE Director, and Select General Education Teachers. Communications to provide awareness and exploration of various college and career opportunities.

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

Principal- provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; supervises the development of Rtl program; ensures that the school-based team is implementing Rtl; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; ensures and participates in appropriate professional learning to support Rtl implementation; develops a culture of expectations with the school's staff for implementation of Rtl school-wide; ensures resources are assigned to those areas in most need and communicates with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities.

Assistant Principal: assists the Principal in all areas of the Principal's role in Rtl

Select General Education Teachers: participate in data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, and collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions.

Exceptional Education Director participates in data collection and integrates core instruction into Tier 3 instruction.

Technology Specialist: The Technology Specialist provides technical support to teachers and staff regarding data retrieval and management, and provides assistance to staff through the installation and management of educational software programs for Tiered instruction.

Guidance Counselor: provides expertise in assessment and intervention with individual students and linking community agencies to support the child's academic and emotional success; provides quality services and

expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; and communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

- ICT classes taught including- Robotics, Cybersecurity, Finance, Business, Gaming, Coding, and