
Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 23 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 23 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Bartow Middle School

550 CLOWER ST E, Bartow, FL 33830

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

*Our mission:

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

*Vision:

One Team - One Goal-One Community

Subscribing to the One Team-One Goal-One Community concept, Bartow Middle School will create a collaborative learning environment that emphasizes student accountability for growth and success. Students and staff will work together to maintain a safe and positive environment. This will be accomplished in a climate that promotes high expectations and strives to meet individual students needs.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Johnson, Dwayne | Principal | |
| Shytle, Katie | Assistant Principal | |
| Keeney, Lauren | Instructional Coach | |
| | | |
| Shelnut, Karrie | Instructional Coach | |
| Childress, Kylee | Teacher, Adult | |
| Mallernee, Thomas | Dean | |
| Birdsong, Angela | Assistant Principal | |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The stakeholders to include: students, parents, school staff, and the community. All stakeholders have had the opportunity to review and provide feedback for improvement on the 23-24 SIP. All are in agreement to continue the same focus areas with the addition of improving community involvement.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The following data points will be used to review the progress towards the SIP: progress monitoring data to assess student’s academic progress, monthly leadership meeting to review data and focus on schoolwide culture including community involvement.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|--|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 54% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 180 | 182 | 513 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 9 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 13 | 25 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 100 | 121 | 301 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 113 | 143 | 334 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 127 | 121 | 360 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 169 | 165 | 141 | 475 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 19 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 |

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 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 |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 95 | 110 | 279 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 124 | 95 | 317 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 9 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 13 | 25 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 100 | 121 | 301 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 113 | 143 | 334 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 109 | 101 | 329 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 | 171 | 159 | 489 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 9 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 34 | 36 | 49 | 33 | 40 | 50 | 35 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 39 | | | 39 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 29 | | | 36 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 39 | 40 | 56 | 36 | 34 | 36 | 31 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 45 | | | 30 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 44 | | | 26 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 39 | 34 | 49 | 36 | 40 | 53 | 34 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 61 | 66 | 68 | 61 | 49 | 58 | 56 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 73 | 70 | 73 | 72 | 46 | 49 | 71 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 36 | 49 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | 66 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 36 | 31 | 40 | 39 | 68 | 76 | 57 | | |

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 47 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 282 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 43 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 434 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 96 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 26 | Yes | 4 | 2 |
| ELL | 37 | Yes | 4 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | Yes | 2 | |
| HSP | 48 | | | |
| MUL | 31 | Yes | 2 | 1 |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | | | |
| FRL | 43 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 29 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| ELL | 35 | Yes | 3 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 44 | | | |
| MUL | 33 | Yes | 1 | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 47 | | | |
| FRL | 41 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 34 | | | 39 | | | 39 | 61 | 73 | | | 36 |
| SWD | 13 | | | 15 | | | 15 | 27 | 57 | | 6 | 30 |
| ELL | 21 | | | 33 | | | 29 | 66 | | | 5 | 36 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 22 | | | 22 | | | 22 | 45 | 65 | | 5 | |
| HSP | 33 | | | 40 | | | 40 | 69 | 69 | | 6 | 34 |
| MUL | 41 | | | 44 | | | 9 | | | | 3 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 39 | | | 44 | | | 45 | 65 | 75 | | 5 | |
| FRL | 30 | | | 33 | | | 32 | 56 | 68 | | 6 | 40 |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 33 | 39 | 29 | 36 | 45 | 44 | 36 | 61 | 72 | | | 39 |
| SWD | 15 | 29 | 21 | 16 | 38 | 39 | 27 | 33 | 60 | | | 14 |
| ELL | 18 | 34 | 40 | 27 | 42 | 56 | 13 | 48 | | | | 39 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 36 | 22 | 25 | 42 | 38 | 25 | 48 | 81 | | | |
| HSP | 31 | 40 | 39 | 36 | 48 | 53 | 26 | 63 | 69 | | | 32 |
| MUL | 33 | 24 | | 22 | 53 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 38 | 40 | 31 | 42 | 45 | 41 | 49 | 63 | 72 | | | |
| FRL | 29 | 38 | 29 | 32 | 45 | 45 | 30 | 53 | 74 | | | 36 |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 35 | 39 | 36 | 31 | 30 | 26 | 34 | 56 | 71 | | | 57 |
| SWD | 13 | 27 | 27 | 12 | 25 | 29 | 16 | 36 | | | | |
| ELL | 20 | 47 | 53 | 22 | 28 | 23 | 11 | 31 | | | | 57 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 40 | 60 | | 50 | 60 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | 32 | 25 | 16 | 27 | 30 | 18 | 46 | 53 | | | |
| HSP | 36 | 44 | 46 | 31 | 31 | 26 | 30 | 48 | 67 | | | 53 |
| MUL | 40 | 50 | | 30 | 20 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 39 | 39 | 35 | 39 | 30 | 23 | 42 | 64 | 75 | | | |
| FRL | 30 | 36 | 34 | 24 | 27 | 24 | 31 | 50 | 65 | | | 48 |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 36% | -4% | 47% | -15% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 33% | 39% | -6% | 47% | -14% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 30% | 35% | -5% | 47% | -17% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 39% | 38% | 1% | 54% | -15% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 35% | -3% | 48% | -16% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 33% | 42% | -9% | 55% | -22% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 36% | 33% | 3% | 44% | -8% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 65% | 37% | 28% | 50% | 15% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 37% | 63% | 48% | 52% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 60% | 65% | -5% | 66% | -6% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

ELA was 34% proficient. Of the two 7th grade ELA classes there was only one certified ELA teacher for the second consecutive school year.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Math, ELA, and Science either increased or stayed the same. Civics went down 1% from the previous school year. Both of the civics teachers were new to the content area.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

There was a 13% difference between the state and school average for ELA. For two consecutive years in 7th grade ELA there was only one certified teacher out of the two classes.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Geometry continues to outperform the state with 100% pass rate. We implemented more academic boot camps as well as blocking the Geometry classes.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Our ESSA groups, with a focus on ELL, SWD, African American, and multi-racial students are not making adequate progress in ELA and Math.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Standards based instruction to ensure that all students receive high quality education and equivalent experiences in the core academic classes.
2. School culture. We will build a culture that supports the individuals needs of students and staff which in turn will increase academic achievement.
3. Using the Learning Arc Process, along with Standard Walkthrough Tool (SWT), collaborative planning, data driven from Qualtrics with help to monitor all process for implementation with fidelity.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Data continues to show that our students on FAST and STAR are making minimum progress towards proficiency in ELA and Math. To address these areas of concern, Bartow will continue to engage students in Corrective Reading as well as Math 180 both programs are interventions used to help support students as they build skills toward master ELA and Math concepts.

Measurable Outcome:

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

School data based on state assessments will show a 3% proficiency increase for all content area as well as a 5% of the students below the proficiency line will become proficient.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring assessment data offered by the district and state will be utilized to monitor student progress towards academic proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Teachers will be engaged in standards based planning protocol using the learning arc framework.
2. Standard walkthrough tool (SWT) will be used to monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to standards based instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Growth mindset principle prescribes that students haven't learned yet the relationship between student academic success is directly aligned to monitoring the planning, teaching, execution and evaluation of standard-based instruction. If implemented with fidelity standard based instruction will increase student proficiency across all grade levels in Math and ELA by 2% as recorded on PM2 data results and by PM3 all grade levels in Math and ELA will increase by 5%.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Create a calendar for calibration walks to include administration, deans, and instructional coaches.

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

By When: By August 31st, 2023

Conduct calibration walks until the team shows 90%-100% calibration consistently with rationale and picture evidence.

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

By When: September 15th, 2023

Establish protocol to review SWT data.

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

By When: This will be done weekly/bi-weekly

Learning Arc. Master schedule that includes collaborative planning.

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

By When: September 15, 2023

Learning Arc. Conduct weekly planning using protocol.

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

By When: Weekly

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

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

By When: Weekly

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Teacher and staff attendance showed that 81% of the staff missed 16+ days during the 22-23 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 23-24 school year teacher/staff attendance will improve by 50%. Meaning that 50% or less of the staff/teachers will be absent 15 days or less.

Monitoring:

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

Teacher attendance will be monitored through the district Inzata platform and school level tracking system.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Monthly incentives for teachers and staff that meet attendance goals, based on a tiered system.

-Perfect attendance

-no more than 1 day absent

Monthly team-building activities to build school culture with teachers/staff.

Activities that focus on positive mental wellness and interactions.

Conduct a book study of "Culturize" by Jimmy Casas. The book shares insight on how to cultivate a community of learners that embody innately human traits. (Teaching teachers how to hone in on their personal soft skills as well as their students.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on research from several universities, when teachers and staff feel supported they are more likely to have better attendance and are less likely to leave the school. Retaining teachers yearly maintains a positive school culture therein increasing student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Keep a running excel spreadsheet of ongoing teacher/staff absences from FOCUS.

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

By When: Monthly

Identify and celebrate staff that has met attendance goal.

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

By When: Monthly

Engage the leadership team with a book study, "Culturize" by Jimmy Casas.

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

By When: Monthly

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Areas of focus will include SWD at 29% proficient, ELL at 35% proficient, Multi-racial at 33% proficient, and African American at 38% proficient. These sub-groups continue to underperform in ELA and Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase SWD proficiency by 12%, ELL proficiency by 6%, Multi-racial by 8%, and African American by 3%. By making these gains, students in each subgroup will reach the 41% threshold of the federal index.

Monitoring:

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

District and state progress monitoring will be utilized to differentiate instruction and support students academic needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will identify the group of targeted students in each ESSA subgroup. Professional learning for teachers and support staff will be conducted to include classroom accommodations for ELL and SWD students, data analysis, differentiated instruction, and remediation strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Refocus staff on schoolwide expectations for targeted students with strategies to use in standards based instruction to include student engagement and equivalent experiences, which will result in an increase in student proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Professional learning on the effective use of classroom accommodations, differentiated instructional strategies, small groups, data analysis, and remediation strategies.

Person Responsible: Lauren Keeney (lauren.keeney@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 31st, 2023

Instructional coaches will conduct ongoing professional learning tailored specifically to teachers needs on classroom accommodations, differentiated instructional strategies, small groups, data analysis, and remediation strategies.

Person Responsible: Lauren Keeney (lauren.keeney@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing monthly

Monitor the fidelity of implementation through classroom walkthroughs and collaborative planning of the professional learning including classroom accommodations, differentiated instructional strategies, small groups, data analysis, and remediation strategies.

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

By When: Ongoing weekly

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Student attendance data showed that 57% of students missed 10+ days during the 22-23 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 23-24 school year student attendance will improve by 20%. Meaning that 45% or less of the students will be absent 9 days or less.

Monitoring:

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

Student attendance will be monitored through the district Inzata platform and FOCUS attendance reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Birdsong (angela.birdsong@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Incentives for students that meet attendance goals, based on a tiered system.

- perfect attendance
- 1-2 days absent per quarter
- Behavior recognition celebrations
- Using the essential 55's to instill the innate ability of students to productively engage in the school and community.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to ed.gov student absenteeism has detrimental effects on student achievement especially in schools with high poverty. Student attendance is a greater predictor of whether students will drop out before graduation, than test scores.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Run attendance reports from the district platform FOCUS

Person Responsible: Angela Birdsong (angela.birdsong@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

Identify and notify students that have 2 or more absences for the month.

Person Responsible: Angela Birdsong (angela.birdsong@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

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

Person Responsible: Angela Birdsong (angela.birdsong@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

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

Person Responsible: Angela Birdsong (angela.birdsong@polk-fl.net)

By When: Each semester

Engage students in Ron Clark's Essential 55.

Person Responsible: Thomas Mallernee (thomas.mallernee@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing daily

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Title 1 funds have been directed towards staff positions to help support teaching and learning. Positions supported by Title 1 are paraeducators, behavior interventionist, and instructional coaches. Dollars have been allocated towards parent involvement which focuses on academic standards, student and parental engagement. General school funding is aligned with academic needs of the students such as intervention resources, manipulatives, and any supplies deemed necessary to support academic achievement.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Title 1 meeting held during September in the evening and during the school advisory committee meetings. Also, posted on the school's website. <https://bms.polkschoolsfl.com/>

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The Parent Family Engagement Plan includes nights to support the core academic content areas providing parents, students, and families with resources to improve student learning. Also, the Parent Family Engagement Plan includes a night for information to be provided to 8th grade students and parents on academic progression and requirements for high school. A 6th grade transition night is provided to parents and incoming 6th graders outlining academic and behavioral expectations as well as elective opportunities available. An online tutorial will be provided to parents informing them of state testing requirements and impacts. Resources will be made available to assist parents in helping their child achieve academic success.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Through professional learning for teachers and staff on standards based instruction, differentiated instruction, accommodations (ELL and SWD), small group instruction, data analysis, and remediation strategies. Purposeful planning focused on an intentional alignment of standards and instruction to include acceleration, as well as remediation.

A focus on ELA standards based instruction including reading and writing strategies to be used across all content areas. Professional learning will provide resources and strategies to meet the needs of the students addressed in the targeted ESSA subgroups.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Resources, such as PACE, will be provided to assist parents and families with strategies and skills to navigate their child's educational journey. Also, Boys and Girls club provides afterschool tutoring and activities for our students. Bartow Rotary in the City of Bartow provides student academic and behavior incentives yearly.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

PACE for girls, mental health counseling, Young Men of the Future and Ladies Leaving Legacies Mentoring groups, mentoring through athletics and cheer club.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A