Bartram Trail High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Bartram Trail High School

7399 LONGLEAF PINE PKWY, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

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.

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, 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
Phelps, Chris	Principal	Oversees the entire school and insures overall SIP is implemented.
Lay, Joe	Assistant Principal	Assists with instructional practices, help with culture and environment at BTHS
Sands, Kerri	Assistant Principal	Focus on instructional practices; School Culture and School Leadership
Stackhouse, Stacy	Assistant Principal	Focus on students with disabilities; school culture and instructional practices
Roughan, Melissa	Registrar	Focus on culture and environment

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.

We utilize SAC, which includes staff, parents, community members and students. We use the meetings as a sounding board of the workings of Bartram Trail and impact on students and the community.

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))

We use the progress monitoring tools established in the school district to monitor the academic performance of our students. Meet regularly with Class Officers to check on culture and environment of the school.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	4%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	598
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	232
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	296
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	255
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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	369

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	34
Students retained two or more times	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	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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	

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	73	71	50	74	74	51	75		
ELA Learning Gains				65			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			56		
Math Achievement*	63	61	38	74	50	38	68		
Math Learning Gains				61			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			39		
Science Achievement*	86	86	64	84	70	40	84		
Social Studies Achievement*	85	82	66	86	59	48	85		
Middle School Acceleration					47	44			
Graduation Rate	97	94	89	99	84	61	98		
College and Career Acceleration	59	64	65	60	86	67	62		
ELP Progress		51	45	69			77		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	463
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	97

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	768
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	99

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	50			
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	68			
HSP	75			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	65			

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	42			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	60			
HSP	65			

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%
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	59			

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	73			63			86	85		97	59	
SWD	33			32			61	54		22	6	
ELL	40			50							2	
AMI												
ASN	85			84			90			72	5	
BLK	58			45			71	83		53	6	
HSP	66			63			88	78		55	6	
MUL	64			63			67	95		40	6	
PAC												
WHT	75			64			88	86		60	6	
FRL	55			46			88	67		39	6	

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	74	65	49	74	61	47	84	86		99	60	69
SWD	25	38	33	36	43	36	50	51		95	17	
ELL	25	57	56	69	69		50					69
AMI												
ASN	87	73	50	83	67		100	97		100	71	

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
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	
PAC												
WHT	77	66	49	77	64	51	85	86		99	62	
FRL	63	59	45	60	50	27	79	69		96	46	

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	75	67	56	68	41	39	84	85		98	62	77
SWD	27	46	40	29	31	31	52	62		95	24	
ELL	47	75	73	50	31					100	50	77
AMI												
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	
PAC												
WHT	77	67	54	71	42	41	84	85		98	63	
FRL	63	57	63	57	37	18	59	71		96	40	

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
10	2023 - Spring	72%	73%	-1%	50%	22%
09	2023 - Spring	74%	70%	4%	48%	26%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	78%	-6%	50%	22%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	67%	-3%	48%	16%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	86%	0%	63%	23%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	82%	3%	63%	22%

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.

SWD overall showed the lowest performance. SWD students historically haven't performed well on standardized tests. Since COVID there has been a downward trend.

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

ELA LG lowest 25% students. Scores dipped from 56% to 49%. We continue to experience changes in instructional personnel. Teachers continue to adjust to new curriculum standards while still dealing with some effects from COVID.

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.

Math Learning Gains of Low 25%. There is an 8% difference between state and Bartram Trail. We have multiple math supports with ESE and tutors, but still need to focus on particular subgroups to bridge the gap.

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

Math Learning Gains. Scores increased from 41% to 61%. We math tutors, common planning and had a math elective to assist children with homework/math concepts.

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

Following COVID -- an area of concern is student attendance. We have seen a trend where students miss more school than pre-COVID years.

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

Protecting PLC time during the school year for teachers
Working on common formatives to help with summative retakes.
Teachers using data from various resources to drive instruction.

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 Professional Learning Communities

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.

The use of PLC with our faculty is part of the vision of the district leadership in St. Johns County. 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 cancel all other school meetings on Wednesday to keep the calendar clear.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

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.

Maintain log of meetings throughout the year
Be an active member of the meetings; getting input from teachers of their needs
Modeling PLC's at department head meetings

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

By When: Continuous process over the course of the year. Do quarterly checkins on status of PLC meetings.

#2. 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 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.

Focus on Math Achievement for Students with Disabilities. The overall performance was 36%; with Math learning gains 0f 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 to 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 math courses and ESE courses. We will participate in the district common summative quarterly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacy Stackhouse (stacy.stackhouse@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Common planning for Algebra teachers
Pullouts with 2 dedicated ESE teachers in math
Hired 2 tutors to work with math classes
Intensive Geometry classes created to help support low achieving students
Class sizes<20

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

Implemented 4 90 minute block classes of Algebra for lowest achieving students as well as sections of Intensive Geometry for students retaking the Algebra test in the fall to continue to work on math concepts. Created math help classes with our teachers to assist with engagement strategies, pacing and data analysis.

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.

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

Person Responsible: Stacy Stackhouse (stacy.stackhouse@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly check-ins to Math PLC's

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

BTHS split into a new high school in 2022-23. We lost 36 teachers that year, plus 10 additional teachers left during the school year. This past year we had to downsize by an additional 10 teachers, plus another 5 additional teachers left this summer.

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 2023-24 school year.

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

We intend to continue monthly faculty meetings to check on the pulse of our staff. We also plan to attend more PLC meetings and meet with teachers during the planning time to check on wellness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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.)

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

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

The success of our students is directly related to the effectiveness and well-being of our teaching staff. Keeping teachrs satisfied, content and hungry is a key to success.

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.

Holding monthly meetings for staff and also new teachers
Regular attendance at PLC meetings
Clinics organized by ILC with instructional strategies

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

By When: Quarterly check-ins with new teachers at new teacher cadre meeting.