

Hardee County Schools

Bowling Green Elementary School



2021-22 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Hardee 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	80%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hardee 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.

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

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.*

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

Total number of students enrolled at the school

292

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

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

2

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	49	54	51	52	37	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	293
Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	7	7	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	6	16	23	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	3	4	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	6	7	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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

Thursday 9/30/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				46%	56%	57%	50%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	56%	58%	54%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	52%	53%	45%	49%	48%
Math Achievement				63%	71%	63%	63%	68%	62%
Math Learning Gains				72%	70%	62%	60%	63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	61%	51%	50%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				28%	43%	53%	44%	47%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	45%	59%	-14%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	57%	-11%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	34%	48%	-14%	56%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	54%	69%	-15%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	73%	2%	64%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	62%	-11%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	26%	42%	-16%	53%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady for K-5 ELA and Math

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9	28	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	25	42
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	43
	English Language Learners	0	20	40
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	19	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	15	33
	Students With Disabilities	0	14	43
	English Language Learners	0	0	40

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14	19	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	17	32
	Students With Disabilities	9	15	17
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	4	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	4	40
	Students With Disabilities	18	9	33
	English Language Learners	25	0	0
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28	44	76
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	41	70
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	29
	English Language Learners	0	33	67
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	31	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	28	55
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	29
	English Language Learners	0	0	33

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	49	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	43	43
	Students With Disabilities	0	13	11
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	43	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	49	62
	Students With Disabilities	0	13	22
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22	34	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	34	44
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	17
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16	44	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	43	67
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	17
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	42	36		44	38		33				
ELL	38			69							
HSP	62	67	50	74	62	62	51				
WHT	70			77			80				
FRL	61	70	55	73	60	50	54				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	493
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	76
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

All grade levels experienced growth from Fall to Spring assessments.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

2nd grade ELA and Math

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

Inexperienced teachers in 2nd grade. 2 of the 3 2nd grade teachers no longer work for Hardee County Schools.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

3rd Grade Math

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

Bowling Green Elementary added Reflex Math as a supplemental computer program.

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

Bowling Green Elementary added Education Galaxy which can be used to accelerate learning by providing differentiated instruction.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities will be provided for Education Galaxy.

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

Maintaining our new supplemental instructional programs for the next year and beyond.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA instruction does not consistently provide increased rigor in ELA instruction as illustrated by our iReady and FSA data.
Measurable Outcome:	To have 5% increase in our FSA and iReady data from the 2020-2021 school year
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring through iReady
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Wilson (awilson@hardee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ready ELA workbooks Ready Reading's rigorous yet support 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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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

Walk-Thru

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

Data Chats

Person Responsible Stuart Durastanti (sdurastanti@hardee.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Bowling Green Elementary was not listed on the Safe Schools for Alex website. Bowling Green Elementary has a very low discipline rate. Our school is focused on positive interventions as a major intervention to discipline. Our Threat Assessment team also meets at least monthly and is very proactive.

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.

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 newsletter is sent home with the students. All notes are sent home in English and Spanish.

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

Stuart Durastanti - Principal
 Ray Rivas- Dean
 Kim Tyson- School Counselor
 Amy Wilson- Reading Coach
 Courtney Durham- Reading Resource

This core leadership team will be responsible for planning and delegating school activities that promote a positive culture and environment. We have numerous activities throughout the school year. Panther tickets is a positive intervention that allows students to earn tickets in the classroom and then redeem said tickets for prizes that are housed in Mr. Rivas' office. Spirit week is another activity that runs from October 4-8 and is lead by Ms. Durham and Mrs. Wilson. At the end of October is Red Ribbon Week that Mrs. Tyson leads.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$212,452.13
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0041 - Bowling Green Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$212,452.13
Total:						\$212,452.13