

St. Johns County School District

# Bartram Trail 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>  |

# Bartram Trail High School

7399 LONGLEAF PINE PKWY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-bths.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Chris Phelps**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/3/2015

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <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>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 4%   |
| <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>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: A (70%)<br>2018-19: A (68%)<br>2017-18: A (68%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>   |
| <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

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns 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>  |

# Bartram Trail High School

7399 LONGLEAF PINE PKWY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-bths.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

## School Demographics

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School<br/>9-12</p> | <p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p> | <p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>4%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>                                    | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>         | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>27%</p>              |

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns 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.

BTHS serves as a center for academic excellence, community involvement and character development, while fostering a joy for lifelong learning.

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

Bartram Trail High School will grow as a center of academic excellence, while developing our future leaders in a diverse and changing society. All partners in learning will be dedicated to character development and community involvement, while equipping students to be successful and responsible citizens.

### 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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Phelps, Chris     | Principal           |                                 |
| Raimann, Parker   | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Sands, Kerri      | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Lay, Joe          | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Salas, Jessica    | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Peaver, Pete      | Dean                |                                 |
| Roughan, Melissa  | Registrar           |                                 |
| Kirkland, Tiffany | Instructional Coach |                                 |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 8/3/2015, Chris Phelps

**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.*

5

**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.*

26

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

109

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

2,510

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

46

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

8

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |     | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 855 | 808 | 786 | 732 | 3181  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 163 | 169 | 157 | 598   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50  | 72  | 64  | 46  | 232   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90  | 90  | 74  | 42  | 296   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0     |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79  | 62  | 44  | 70  | 255   |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0     |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |     |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9  | 10  | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 119 | 96 | 77 | 369   |

**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 | 9 | 13 | 11 | 1  | 34    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 8/30/2022



**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 | 0 | 845 | 801 | 737 | 695   | 3078 |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 | 145 | 181 | 120   | 582  |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53  | 36  | 54  | 32    | 175  |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27  | 22  | 19  | 50    | 118  |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0     |      |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81  | 55  | 47  | 46    | 229  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0     |      |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0     |      |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |    |     | Total |     |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|----|-----|-------|-----|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10  | 11 | 12  |       |     |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117 | 94 | 111 | 62    | 384 |

**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 | 34 | 30 | 38 | 24    | 126 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 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 | 845 | 801 | 737 | 695   | 3078 |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 | 145 | 181 | 120   | 582  |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53  | 36  | 54  | 32    | 175  |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27  | 22  | 19  | 50    | 118  |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0     |      |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81  | 55  | 47  | 46    | 229  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0     |      |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0     |      |

**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 | 117 | 94 | 111 | 62    | 384 |

**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 | 34 | 30 | 38 | 24    | 126 |
| 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             | 74%    | 74%      | 51%   |        |          |       | 75%    | 74%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 65%    |          |       |        |          |       | 58%    | 60%      | 51%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 49%    |          |       |        |          |       | 48%    | 50%      | 42%   |
| Math Achievement            | 74%    | 50%      | 38%   |        |          |       | 75%    | 73%      | 51%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 61%    |          |       |        |          |       | 48%    | 58%      | 48%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 47%    |          |       |        |          |       | 43%    | 55%      | 45%   |
| Science Achievement         | 84%    | 70%      | 40%   |        |          |       | 87%    | 86%      | 68%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 86%    | 59%      | 48%   |        |          |       | 89%    | 88%      | 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        | 86%    | 87%      | -1%                   | 67%   | 19%                |

| 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        | 89%    | 88%      | 1%                    | 70%   | 19%                |

| ALGEBRA EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        | 74%    | 79%      | -5%                   | 61%   | 13%                |

| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 77%    | 81%      | -4%                   | 57%   | 20%                |

**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                                       | 25       | 38     | 33          | 36        | 43      | 36           | 50       | 51      |           | 95                | 17                  |
| ELL                                       | 25       | 57     | 56          | 69        | 69      |              | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 87       | 73     | 50          | 83        | 67      |              | 100      | 97      |           | 100               | 71                  |
| BLK                                       | 49       | 60     | 50          | 54        | 56      | 39           | 73       | 82      |           | 97                | 43                  |
| HSP                                       | 70       | 63     | 52          | 62        | 53      | 38           | 77       | 80      |           | 97                | 55                  |
| MUL                                       | 63       | 56     | 36          | 72        | 54      | 33           | 86       | 89      |           | 95                | 63                  |
| WHT                                       | 77       | 66     | 49          | 77        | 64      | 51           | 85       | 86      |           | 99                | 62                  |
| FRL                                       | 63       | 59     | 45          | 60        | 50      | 27           | 79       | 69      |           | 96                | 46                  |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 27       | 46     | 40          | 29        | 31      | 31           | 52       | 62      |           | 95                | 24                  |
| ELL                                       | 47       | 75     | 73          | 50        | 31      |              |          |         |           | 100               | 50                  |
| ASN                                       | 85       | 64     |             | 82        | 43      |              | 96       | 92      |           | 100               | 83                  |
| BLK                                       | 66       | 77     | 78          | 43        | 31      | 24           | 75       | 79      |           | 98                | 38                  |
| HSP                                       | 71       | 59     | 49          | 64        | 40      | 42           | 83       | 78      |           | 100               | 57                  |
| MUL                                       | 62       | 68     | 64          | 70        | 53      |              | 75       | 95      |           | 100               | 62                  |
| WHT                                       | 77       | 67     | 54          | 71        | 42      | 41           | 84       | 85      |           | 98                | 63                  |
| FRL                                       | 63       | 57     | 63          | 57        | 37      | 18           | 59       | 71      |           | 96                | 40                  |
| 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                                       | 30       | 37     | 33          | 43        | 37      | 32           | 53       | 57      |           | 95                | 26                  |
| ASN                                       | 88       | 60     |             | 89        | 48      |              | 92       | 89      |           | 100               | 82                  |
| BLK                                       | 54       | 47     | 30          | 54        | 39      | 19           | 54       | 80      |           | 94                | 42                  |
| HSP                                       | 70       | 57     | 53          | 68        | 49      | 47           | 90       | 83      |           | 97                | 62                  |
| MUL                                       | 68       | 32     |             | 85        | 27      |              | 93       | 91      |           | 100               | 58                  |
| WHT                                       | 76       | 59     | 49          | 77        | 49      | 44           | 89       | 90      |           | 98                | 64                  |
| FRL                                       | 54       | 38     | 27          | 50        | 30      | 16           | 76       | 76      |           | 83                | 49                  |

**ESSA Data Review**

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

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | 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 | 69  |

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>  |     |
|--|-----|
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                      | 768 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 11  |
| Percent Tested   | 99% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>   |     |
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>  |     |
| 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   |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 56  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| <b>Native American Students</b>  |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Asian Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 81  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 60  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 65  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 65  |

| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0   |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 72  |
| 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                                | 59  |
| 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 Social Studies and Science achievement scores remained constant. Math Learning Gains increased from 41% to 61%. ELA LG Lowest 25% dropped from 56% to 49%. Our SWD subgroup scored significantly below the school averages. Our overall score increased as a school.

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

Assisting our ELA LG Lowest 25% students. Scores dipped from 56% to 49%.

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

Change in instructional personnel throughout the 2021-22 school year. We lost 5 ELA teachers in grades 9/10 from September to February. With this we had multiple subs. Teachers also had to adjust to new curriculum standards while still dealing with effects of COVID. We lost teachers with the opening of a new school and created new 9/10 teams for ELA PLC's.

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

Math Learning Gains ---- increased from 41% to 61%.

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

Teachers taking shields down. Math coach helping teachers with planning and student engagement.  
Tutors doing pullouts and common planning

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

Small Group instruction strategies modeled by ILC  
Differentiation based on PLC data from common summatives  
Online tutorials -- APEX; Khan; teacher created

**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.**

Performance Matters training during rolling Professional Development  
Ongoing coaching cycles with ILC focusing on new instructors along with their PLC  
ILC providing instructional support desegregating data for all subjects  
Subs provided to teachers to work in PLC for unit planning and sharing

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

Monthly meetings for coaching new teachers. ILC's and PLC meeting time that is protected throughout the school year. Staff learning how to use all the resources in Performance Matters to guide instruction.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

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

Focus on Math Achievement for Student with Disabilities. The overall performance was 36%; with Math learning gains of 43% and Math learning gains of LQ25 of 36%.

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

We hope achieve a 50% Achievement level for our Students with Disabilities.

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

We will utilize common assessments across the general education courses and ESE courses. We will also participate in the district common formative quarterly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Parker Raimann (parker.raimann@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Common planning for Algebra teachers  
 Pull out through 2 dedicated ESE teachers certified in math.  
 Hired 2 Tutors working specifically with math classes.  
 Intensive Geometry classes created to support low achieving math students  
 Class Size < 20  
 ESE support teachers selected for their math understanding; added additional days of support

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

Implemented 4 90 minute blocks of Algebra for lowest achieving students as well as 3 sections of Intensive Geometry for students who will be retaking the Algebra test in the fall to continue to work on math concepts. Created common planning for our Algebra teachers to focus on engagement strategies, pacing and data analysis. ESE support teachers strategically placed to have access to planning time with Algebra teachers.



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

Moved the blocks of math to the morning of the day to help with engagement. The math department heads work directly with our teachers to share and support strategies. We support the math classes with ESE teachers and 2 math tutors.

**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.

Continue to implement the PLC process between math teachers and ESE teachers  
Tutors placed strategically to assist our SWD students  
Common District Formative that reflect state test type questions

**Person Responsible** Parker Raimann (parker.raimann@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention**

**Area of Focus Description and**

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

BTHS split into a new high school for 2022-23. We lost 36 teachers to the split plus an additional 10 left during the school year.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

We hope to retain all teachers throughout the 2022-23 school year. We felt with the loss of teachers during the school year last year -- kids didn't perform as well especially in ELA.

**Monitoring:**

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

We intend to re-instate monthly faculty meetings to check on the pulse of our faculty. Attend more PLC meetings and dropping in to meet teachers during their planning time.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Chris Phelps (chris.phelps@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Keeping a solid, stable faculty helps with teacher effectiveness and efficiency. Teachers helping teachers throughout the year will keep everyone overcome the adversity of a school year.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The success of our students is directly related to the effectiveness of our teaching staff. Keeping teachers satisfied, content and hungry is the key to success.

**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. Holding monthly meetings
2. Regular attendance at PLC meetings
3. Holding clinics with ILC for additional instructional strategies

**Person Responsible**

Kerri Sands (kerri.sands@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**

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

The use of PLC with our faculty is part of the vision of the district leadership in St. Johns. We believe teachers working together offers the best educational experience for our students.

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

We will maintain a schedule where Wednesday's are free for PLC meetings throughout the school year.

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

Administration will make it a weekly task to attend PLC meetings and support the teams in their educational journeys. Meetings occur on Wednesday and we cancelled all other school meetings for Wednesday to keep calendar clear.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Joe Lay (joe.lay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

PLC meetings drives instruction for the various target groups of students at BTHS. Teachers will use their PLC meeting time to better meet the needs of our students.

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

The data derived from PLC meetings help teachers determine the best action to meet the needs of the students. The PLC's will discuss the data to help drive instruction.

**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. Maintain log of meetings throughout the year
2. Be an active member of the meetings; asking teachers what they need to be successful.
3. Modeling PLC's at department head meetings

**Person Responsible** Joe Lay (joe.lay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Interventions and Support**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Focus for the year in class meetings was -- "Leave it better than you found it." Find opportunities to help others during your time at school, make a situation better, be a positive influence and leave your school, class, peer better than you found it.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Continue to create culture based on BEAR Standards -- Be on Time; Be Prepared; Be Respectful; Give your best Effort. We continue to make this a topic at class meetings and class visits while also working with Link Crew, Clubs and intern programs throughout the year.

**Monitoring:**

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

We required clubs when completing this years organization paperwork to state how they plan to leave the school or community better than they found it. Club sponsors will provide quarterly feedback throughout the year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jessica Salas (jessica.salas@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Link Crew; Digital Citizenship in media center; Be the Light; Sportsmanship speech before the athletic events; NHS and other club initiatives.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

We are looking at multiple opportunities for student leadership and making the most of your time at Bartram Trail High School. Link Crew and NHS are established programs that allow students to impact other students. Reading a pledge of sportsmanship before all athletic events share the character counts pillars with our community.

**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. Monitor student group impact on peers.
2. Continue to create culture of great habits that carry beyond high school.

**Person Responsible**

Jessica Salas (jessica.salas@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

## 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.

Here at Bartram, we encourage students to follow the Bear Standards and ROAR:

Bear Standards  
Be On Time  
Be Prepared  
Be Respectful  
Give Your Best Effort

Respect all  
Own their actions  
Advocate  
Reach their highest potential

These expectations were founded within the six pillars of character counts: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship. We have embedded these pillars deep into our school's culture.

As you walk our campus, you will see visual representation of our initiatives in hallways and all classrooms. We have implemented a PAWsitive referral system in which staff can nominate students for showcasing the pillars of character. Nominated students receive a card with an encouraging note of gratitude from the nominator and can bring this card to redeem a reward during lunch.

Every club on campus adopts a character counts goal to focus on, in addition to their various planned service projects and community activities throughout the year.

New this year are our connect clubs and sports. Within every connect organization are student leaders who are professionally trained through workshops to be inclusive and welcoming of all students. Connect clubs and sports teams are recognized on our website with the puzzle piece logo.

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

Club sponsors are responsible for helping students and club members be a positive influence in the school community. Ms. Salas operates the PAWsitive program and recognizes students weekly. She also highlights students through the school twitter account. School counselors promote positive culture with the Wednesday Counselor in the courtyard program.