

Hardee County Schools

Bowling Green Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Bowling Green Elementary School

4530 CHURCH AVE, Bowling Green, FL 33834

www.hardee.k12.fl.us/bowling_green

Demographics

Principal: Stuart Durastanti

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Hardee County School Board on 10/8/2020.

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.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Bowling Green Elementary School

4530 CHURCH AVE, Bowling Green, FL 33834

www.hardee.k12.fl.us/bowling_green

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Hardee County School Board on 10/8/2020.

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.

We provide all students a high-quality education in a nurturing and creative environment to develop responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empower and inspire all students for success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Durastanti, Stuart	Principal	
Wilson , Amy	Instructional Coach	
Rivas, Ray	Dean	
Flores, Gloria	Teacher, K-12	
Morris, Debbie	Teacher, K-12	
Butler, Christina	Teacher, K-12	
Derringer, Brittany	Teacher, K-12	
Arce, Irma	Teacher, K-12	
Garcia, Roxanne	Teacher, K-12	
Albritton, Miranda	Teacher, K-12	
Tyson, Kim	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Stuart Durastanti

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

26

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

The number of students by 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	45	59	51	36	43	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	7	5	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	5	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	64	53	50	50	57	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	331
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	0	0	0	

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	7	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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	64	53	50	50	57	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	331
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	0	0	0	

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	7	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	56%	57%	46%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	58%	48%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	52%	53%	68%	56%	52%
Math Achievement	63%	71%	63%	63%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	70%	62%	63%	66%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	61%	51%	46%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	28%	43%	53%	43%	47%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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
03	2019	45%	59%	-14%	58%	-13%
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	57%	-11%	58%	-12%
	2018	45%	50%	-5%	56%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	34%	48%	-14%	56%	-22%
	2018	47%	51%	-4%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	69%	-15%	62%	-8%
	2018	71%	68%	3%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	73%	2%	64%	11%
	2018	52%	64%	-12%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	51%	62%	-11%	60%	-9%
	2018	58%	65%	-7%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	26%	42%	-16%	53%	-27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	39%	45%	-6%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	40			53							
ELL	70	62		80	85						
HSP	44	47	61	63	71	63	27				
WHT	58	64		64	79						
FRL	49	51	61	61	69	62	24				
2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	44	46		56	62						
ELL	54	60		71	45						
BLK	58			50							
HSP	50	57	50	64	60	50	49				
WHT	46	35		64	65		40				
FRL	48	53	43	61	59	50	42				
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	20	46		30	54						
ELL	22			61							
BLK	50			75							
HSP	47	45	63	64	63	54	37				
WHT	46	50		54	58		58				
FRL	46	47	69	61	61	47	41				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	71
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	66
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

5th Grade Science- Low morale in 5th grade (2019). Two teachers in their last year of teaching.

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

3rd Grade Math- Incoming low performing group (2019). New teacher to the grade level.

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.

5th Grade Science- Low morale in 5th grade (2019). Two teachers in their last year of teaching.

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

4th Grade math- New teacher in grade level (2019).

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Level 1s on statewide assessment in 5th grade.

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

1. 5th Grade Science
2. 3rd Grade Math
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: BGE's lowest performing data component for 2018-19 was 5th Grade Science. We had a 13 point drop in 5th Grade Science from the previous year. The drop in 5th Grade Science negatively affected our total points possible on our school grade. This area of focus directly impacts student learning and success for their grade class selection.

Measurable Outcome: Our measurable outcome is to increase our Science Achievement from 26% to 38% for the 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Wilson (awilson@hardee.k12.fl.us)

Delta Science Readers through Delta Resources

Evidence-based Strategy: FOSS Next Generation puts the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) into practice by integrating all three dimensions: the Disciplinary Core ideas, the Science and Engineering Practice, and the Crosscutting Concepts, all within our classroom-proven tools and strategies to engage students and teachers in enduring experiences that lead to deeper understanding of the natural and designed world.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: FOSS Next Generation:
Engages all students with meaningful active learning experiences.
Prepares all students to succeed with the NGSS performance expectations.
Integrates robust reading and literacy strategies to support the ELA for all students.
Utilizes technology to deliver learning experiences and provide teachers with time-saving classroom management resources.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review of Lesson Plans
2. Walk-Thru Data
3. Data Chats

Person Responsible: Amy Wilson (awilson@hardee.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	Rigor in ELA
Description and Rationale:	ELA instruction does not consistently provide increased rigor in ELA instruction as illustrated by our iReady and FSA data.
Measurable Outcome:	Our measurable outcome is to have a 10% increase in our FSA and iReady data from 2018-2019 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Wilson (awilson@hardee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ready ELA workbooks
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Ready Reading's rigorous yet supportive content is proven to make today's demanding standards reachable for all students. Its complex, authentic texts engage students in opportunities to practice close reading strategies across a variety of genres and formats. Reading Reading instruction uses a consistent Read, Think, Talk, Write model in which teacher-led discussion and small group collaboration are central to student achievement. Lessons scaffold to build students' confidence as they develop important critical thinking and analytical skills. Students are immediately engaged by the variety of real-world source texts, from literature and poetry to blogs and news articles.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review of Lesson Plans
2. Walk-Thru
3. Data Chats

Person Responsible Amy Wilson (awilson@hardee.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Leadership team will conduct monthly meetings to address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Bowling Green Elementary has strong ties with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students. Every teacher is required to conduct a parent-teacher conference. At the parent-teacher conference the school compact is signed and all important information is shared with the parents. Bowling Green Elementary will also have at least 15 parent involvement activities throughout the year. The Annual Title I meeting is conducted at the beginning of the year. Also, a monthly newsletters is sent home with the students. All notes are sent home in English and Spanish.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0041 - Bowling Green Elementary School			\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$212,452.13
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0041 - Bowling Green Elementary School			\$212,452.13
Total:						\$212,452.13