Boyette Springs Elementary School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
mission
ambitious
family and community involvement
school improvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
success
areas of focus
instruction
needs assessment
resources
growth
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Boyette Springs Elementary School

10141 SEDGEBROOK DR, Riverview, FL 33569

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Mccrystal

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	47%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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

Boyette Springs Elementary School

10141 SEDGEBROOK DR, Riverview, FL 33569

[no web address on file]

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	No	47%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Boyette Springs Elementary School, building a school where everyone is challenged to achieve their personal best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Boyette Springs ...creating a community where individuals are valued and encouraged to continually explore, learn, and grow.

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
McCrystal, Jennifer	Principal	The Principal directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of an elementary, adult, ESE or other specialized public school sites. The Principal demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards. Specific Duties & Responsibilities: Develops and coordinates educational programs through meetings with staff, reviews of teachers' activities, and issuance of directives ? Administers and develops educational programs for students with mental or physical disabilities. ? Confers with teachers, students, and parents concerning educational and behavioral problems in school .? Establishes and maintains relationships with colleges, community organizations, and other schools to coordinate educational services .? Requisitions and allocates supplies, equipment, and instructional material as needed. ? Directs preparation of class schedules, cumulative records, and attendance reports ? Walks about school building and property to monitor safety and security. ? Plans and monitors school budget. ? Plans for and directs building maintenance. ? Performs any other duties as assigned.
Cross, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Teacher at the Center for Gifted Studies Maintain the School Improvement Plan Chair the School Advisory Counsel Contribute to the Instructional Leadership Team

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/3/2020, Jennifer Mccrystal

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.*

2

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	47%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson

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	105	116	133	137	144	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	780
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	5	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	4	5	9	1	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/15/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	69%	52%	57%	71%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	55%	58%	69%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	50%	53%	51%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	54%	63%	72%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	57%	62%	61%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	46%	51%	35%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	50%	53%	69%	48%	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	69%	52%	17%	58%	11%
	2018	70%	53%	17%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	55%	15%	58%	12%
	2018	69%	55%	14%	56%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	68%	54%	14%	56%	12%
	2018	63%	51%	12%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	54%	10%	62%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	62%	55%	7%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	57%	10%	64%	3%
	2018	70%	57%	13%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	73%	54%	19%	60%	13%
	2018	63%	54%	9%	61%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	68%	51%	17%	53%	15%
	2018	59%	52%	7%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	43	38	50	57	29	48				
ELL	38	42		46	67						
BLK	59	48	50	70	66	54	67				
HSP	62	59	48	57	56	42	61				
MUL	76	62		73	62		77				
WHT	73	56	38	72	74	42	71				
FRL	53	52	34	52	56	35	51				
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	27	44	45	34	42	30	17				
ELL	29	58		21	58						
BLK	56	59	58	58	65	53	43				
HSP	59	62	80	57	65	47	64				
MUL	71	59		65	62						
WHT	73	55	32	73	55	22	61				
FRL	57	52	54	56	57	44	53				

| 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	26	48	46	28	24	17	21				
ELL	19	29	13	22	29	21					
ASN	90			90							
BLK	66	65		63	55		50				
HSP	64	62	30	60	53	32	62				
MUL	78	83		91	67						
WHT	74	72	63	76	65	41	74				
FRL	55	62	43	60	57	32	51				

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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	90
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	509
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	57
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	59
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
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	48
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.

The data component which showed the lowest performance is ELA Lowest 25 Percentile with 44% and Math Lowest 25 Percentile at 44% as well. However, it should be noted Math Lowest 25 percentile increased from 39% the previous year (2018) to 44% in 2019. The contributing factors was the focus on math instruction since 2018 school year's SIP Area of Focus was to increase math scores. Although it is not ideal, at times, the focus will shift from one subject to another unintentionally.

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

Unfortunately, ELA Lowest 25 Percentile was not only our lowest performance, it was also our greatest decline from the previous year from 51% making gains in 2018 to only 44% of our lowest 25 percentile students making gains in 2019. When discussed at our Instructional Leadership Team meeting, the factors which contributed to the decrease is a lack of consistency with reading small groups across campus and consistent and clear writing instruction from kindergarten to fifth grade.

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.

The data component which had the greatest gap is again the ELA Lowest 25 Percentile with 44% at our school compared to 53% at the state level. The Math Lowest 25 Percentile at 44% also shared the greatest gap compared to the state's 51% of students making gains. However, again it can be stated that we showed an increased in math gains for our lowest 25 percentile students. The trends which contributed to these factors in reading are due to limited small group instruction based on individual need for our students.

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

The area which showed most improvement is our Math Learning Gains and Science Achievement. One of the new actions our school took was needs based and standards based instruction in math. In fact, one of our areas of focus for last year's SIP was for us to show math gains with all students. As a school, we focused our instruction on standards based planning in all grade levels with support of the school and district personnel. Grade levels met weekly to discuss standards planning, formative and summative assessments, individual instruction, and teacher reflection. For science, our 5th grade team utilized our enrichment cluster time to instruct students on academic areas as well as RtI time focused on reading instruction using science texts and tools.

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

According our our EWS data, Boyette has only one major area of concern reflected in our FSA Level 1 scoring students.

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

1. Small group instruction in language arts
2. Small group instruction in math
3. Continued standards based planning in language arts

4. Continued standards based planning in math
5. Continued Professional Learning Communities in all grade levels

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will set our bottom quartile groups in iReady to create targeted lesson plans to address individual needs through rigorous, data-driven, small group instruction.

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.

We have a SAC committee that encourages parent participation. We have a PTA that plans multiple family events. The Center for Gifted Studies holds multiple informtion sessions to best meet the needs of Gifted students. Robotics, Chorus and Odessy of the Mind rely heavily on parent involvement. Parents are encourages to be participaants in the PBIS plan and rewards systems. We have a robust system of volunteers that help support opperations in our school.

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: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**