

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Boyette Springs 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Boyette Springs Elementary School

10141 SEDGEBROOK DR, Riverview, FL 33569

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Mccrystal

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	47%
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* 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	45%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McCrystal, Jennifer	Principal	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Cross, Amanda	SAC Member	<p>Teacher at the Center for Gifted Studies Maintain the School Improvement Plan Chair the School Advisory Counsel Contribute to the Instructional Leadership Team</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, 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.*

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

731

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

5

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

5

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	122	104	116	129	132	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	29	24	20	20	24	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	2	0	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	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 12/12/2021

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	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		

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	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	

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				69%	52%	57%	68%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	55%	58%	58%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	50%	53%	51%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				69%	54%	63%	67%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	57%	62%	60%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	46%	51%	39%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				69%	50%	53%	61%	51%	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	69%	52%	17%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	70%	55%	15%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	54%	14%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	57%	10%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	54%	19%	60%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	68%	51%	17%	53%	15%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

K- ELA & Math - iReady

5th Science District Baseline/MidYear/SSS

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36	41	60.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	31	32
	Students With Disabilities	33	21	21
	English Language Learners	40	40	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23.5	37	52.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	22	4
	Students With Disabilities	21	21	5
	English Language Learners	14	16	0
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46	50	53.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	34	29
	Students With Disabilities	25	16	22
	English Language Learners	18	27	27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29.4	34.9	53.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	18	0
	Students With Disabilities	18	22	0
	English Language Learners	20	20	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	57.5	46.7	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	37	34
	Students With Disabilities	22	16	6
	English Language Learners	33	33	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29.6	21.9	46.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	6	0
	Students With Disabilities	6	0	0
	English Language Learners	16	16	16
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40.3	38.8	51.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	27	11
	Students With Disabilities	18	9	8
	English Language Learners	10	10	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30.6	20.9	45.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	11	2
	Students With Disabilities	22	9	4
	English Language Learners	10	10	10

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46.5	33.3	40.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	14	9
	Students With Disabilities	41	11	10
	English Language Learners	14	14	14
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33.4	23.3	43.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	8	0
	Students With Disabilities	16	11	5
	English Language Learners	14	14	14
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55	63	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	38	40
	Students With Disabilities	46	33	35
	English Language Learners	19	27	28

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	39	70	75	42	63		39				
ELL	27			47							
ASN	82			91							
BLK	65	87		71	60		63				
HSP	53	69	58	61	69	64	43				
MUL	86	62		79	77		63				
WHT	79	67	80	74	78		76				
FRL	58	71	74	59	67	64	45				
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						

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
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				

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	68
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	547
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	69
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
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	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	64
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?

20% of 20-21 third graders scored a Level 2 on FSA ELA. Moving these students to proficiency is critical. · Historically, fourth graders struggle to maintain their proficiency with the addition of writing to FSA ELA, negatively impacting ELA Gains · Almost 50% of 20-21 students scoring a Level 1 or 2, were not SWD but struggled with motivation and/or behavior challenges. · 20 % of 20-21 students scored a Level 5 on FSA ELA and 23 % of students scored a Level 5 on Math. Maintaining this level of performance has its own unique challenges.

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

Increasing the number of students maintaining and gaining proficiency as well as maintaining growth for all students.

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

Because of the disruption of education due to the COVID 19 pandemic, students have skill gaps. Students need acceleration to close the gaps and bring all students to both growth and proficiency.

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

Growth and proficiency both improved through small group instruction implemented for the previous two years.

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

We really focused on small group instruction and targeting instruction for students with disabilities.

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

To accelerate learning, we will need to focus on behavioral supports as a key to motivating all students, continuing to make data based decision to guide instruction, and increasing knowledge of foundational skills in both primary and intermediate.

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.

We will implement a multi-session Love and Logic training to increase relationship building with students. We will implement grade level professional development to focus on standards based instruction with a small group focus.

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

We will continue to implement the instructional strategies gained in last year's study of Data Driven Instruction. Continuing to utilize data based decision making in addition to gaining new skills will help us continue to target instruction to student need.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to a staff survey as well as overall evaluation rubric data, student engagement was identified as critical to advance all learners. Almost 50% of 20-21 students scoring a Level 1 or 2, were not SWD but struggled with motivation and/or behavior challenges.
Measurable Outcome:	In the year 2021-2022, the number of reported students with motivation and/or behavioral challenges will decrease by 10%.
Monitoring:	We will monitor student incidents as well as teacher reporting to Problem Solving Leadership Team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer McCrystal (jennifer.mccrystal@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will increase relationship building with students by implementing on going training focused on the techniques in Love and Logic.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Love and Logic is a research based method for relationship building. This will help teachers gain concrete strategies to build relationships with students to increase motivation and decrease behavioral incidents.

Action Steps to Implement

Multidate professional development focused on Love and Logic.

Person Responsible	Amanda Cross (amanda.cross@hcps.net)
---------------------------	--------------------------------------

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to a staff survey and student progress monitoring data, creating was identified as critical to advance all learners. Historically, fourth graders struggle to maintain their proficiency with the addition of writing to FSA ELA, negatively impacting ELA Gains. 20 % of 20-21 students scored a Level 5 on FSA ELA and 23 % of students scored a Level 5 on Math, maintaining this level of performance has its own unique challenges.

Measurable Outcome: In 2021-2022, we will increase the percentage of 4th graders scoring a level 3 or higher in reading and maintain our percentage of students scoring a level 5 or higher.

Monitoring: We will monitor our progress toward this goal by utilizing district based progress monitoring tools such as iReady diagnostics and benchmark testing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer McCrystal (jennifer.mccrystal@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will focus on delivering standards based planning with a small group focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy will allow us to target instruction based on student need to accelerate learning for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

We will use standards based grade level professional development to increase dynamic implementation of small group strategies.

Person Responsible: Jennifer McCrystal (jennifer.mccrystal@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to a staff survey as well as FSA and progress monitoring data, foundational skills were identified as critical to advance all learners. 20% of 20-21 third graders scored a Level 2 on FSA ELA. Moving these students to proficiency is critical.

Measurable Outcome: In 2021-2022, we will decrease the percentage of students scoring a level 1 and 2 on FSA and we will increase the percentage of students scoring a level 3 or higher.

Monitoring: We will monitor this using district progress monitoring tools such as iReady and benchmark testing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer McCrystal (jennifer.mccrystal@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will build foundational skills in the intermediate grades & acceleration strategies for striving primary students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We decided to focus on building strategies to increase foundational skills to increase achievement based on teacher reporting and iReady reports.

Action Steps to Implement

We will utilize 3-5 iReady Phonics and have SWD Teachers share BrainSpring pieces with Primary Teachers.

Person Responsible Jennifer McCrystal (jennifer.mccrystal@hcps.net)

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.

We had 1 violent incident per 100 students last year. This year we will focus on behavioral engagement. We will monitor the school culture and environment by using behavioral incident reporting as well as information from the evaluation rubric on techniques and successes used on campus for behavioral engagement.

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.

We use a PBIS system to build a positive school culture and environment. Students are able to earn virtual tokens and earn rewards to motivate students toward being a good school citizen and contributing to positive school culture. In addition to PBIS we also have school wide expectations to help students follow community standards for behavior.

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

Administrative team, Jennifer McCrystal and Elisa Walker, set forth school wide behavioral expectations and motivate staff and students through the PBIS system. Student Services Team, Wayne Shaw, guidance counselor, Tamara Wohlwend, school psychologist, and Herbert Tisdale, school social worker, maintain the PBIS system and address emotional concerns on an individual student basis as well as maintain the school store. Teachers implement the PBIS system and set up in class reward options.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: B.E.S.T. Standards	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00