Bowling Green Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (62%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	74%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		B	B

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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

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	
Arce, Irma	Teacher, K-12	
Butler, Christina	Teacher, K-12	
Derringer, Brittany	Teacher, K-12	
Flores, Gloria	Teacher, K-12	
Morris, Debbie	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Stuart Durastanti

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
25

Total number of students enrolled at the school

287

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

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	53	55	53	50	40	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	300
Attendance below 90 percent	5	7	6	7	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	8	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	4	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	15	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	2	21	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	2	2	17	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	2	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	54%	56%				46%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	65%						50%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						62%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	67%	45%	50%				63%	71%	63%
Math Learning Gains	74%						72%	70%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%						65%	61%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	64%	59%				28%	43%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	45%	59%	-14%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	57%	-11%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	48%	-14%	56%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	54%	69%	-15%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	75%	73%	2%	64%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2022					
	2019	51%	62%	-11%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	26%	42%	-16%	53%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	38	53		50	47						
ELL	23			38							
HSP	52	66	50	66	78	69	64				
WHT	57	50		67	43						
FRL	52	67	50	67	75	57	63				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	486
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47

Students With Disabilities	
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	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	62
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	54
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	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

A noticeable decrease in 3-5 grade ELA proficiency
A noticeable increase in Science proficiency
A slight decrease in Math proficiency

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

3rd Grade ELA

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

The school needs to focus on aligning tasks to the Standard/Benchmark. Understanding what is being asked by the Standard/Benchmark and aligning the task to the requirements.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science Proficiency hit an all-time at Bowling Green Elementary with 64% of students scoring a 3 or higher.

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

Science is consistently embedded into all areas. Students are interested, naturally, in science, so they are more engaged when it is used as a teaching engagement strategy

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

Aligning tasks to the depth of the Standard/Benchmark will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning.

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 implemented that allow teachers to dig into the Standard/ Benchmark so that they understand what is being asked of the student. During collaborative planning, tasks will be vetted to ensure that the requirements of the Standard/Benchmark are being met.

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

eacher placement adjustments, consistency over time with effective programs and practices, ongoing PD, monitoring use, monitoring data to determine teacher effectiveness and student learning outcomes

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	What) Description of Area of Focus: Instructional Practice specifically relating to standards-aligned instruction will focus on supporting teachers with research-based practices that follow state adopted standards within the specific content area. (Why) Rational for Area of Focus: K-2 iReady Data. Grade K had 81% of students scoring on grade level. 1st grade had 46% of students scoring on grade level. 2nd grade has 56% of students scoring on grade level. Data showed that 1st grade was below 50% on grade level and 2nd grade was close to below 50% on grade level. This data showed that there was a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade-appropriate standards. Rational for Area of Focus: FSA ELA Data. 3rd grade had 66% of students scoring below a level 3. 4th grade had 34% of students scoring below a level 3. 5th grade had 36% of students scoring below a level 3. Data showed that 3rd grade was well below 50% scoring a level 3. Students were not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks, and teachers need additional support in effective teaching methods to support learning at the proficiency level especially as it relates to new BEST standards in ELA.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Proficiency in ELA will be at or above 50% as measured by the FAST assessments (STAR and Cambium) the end of the 2022-2023 school year.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Data review of Common Assessments and state progress monitoring tool benchmarks (FAST Assessments) 2 Leadership team will walk classrooms to collect data on implementation of instruction planned during PLCs and student learning outcomes 3. Trend data will be communicated to teachers by administration 4. Individual feedback will be communicated to teachers by administration and coaches based on data outcomes. 5. Leadership team will use walkthrough data to tier teachers based on established criteria and identify support needed 6. Documentation in collaborative planning documents and notes
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Tyson (ktyson@hardee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy	Utilize curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all students.

being implemented for this Area of Focus.	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	When teachers identify gaps in learning and intentional plan for instruction, student outcomes will improve.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

What) Description of Area of Focus: Instructional Practice specifically relating to standards- aligned instruction will focus on supporting teachers with research-based practices that follow state adopted standards within the specific content area. (Why) Rational for Area of Focus: K-2 iReady Data. Grade K had 81% of students scoring on grade level. 1st grade had 46% of students scoring on grade level. 2nd grade has 56% of students scoring on grade level. Data showed that 1st grade was below 50% on grade level and 2nd grade was close to below 50% on grade level. This data showed that there was a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade-appropriate standards. Students were not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks, and teachers need additional support in effective teaching methods to support learning at the proficiency level especially as it relates to new BEST standards in ELA.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

What) Description of Area of Focus: Instructional Practice specifically relating to standards- aligned instruction will focus on supporting teachers with research-based practices that follow state adopted standards within the specific content area. (Why) Rational for Area of Focus: FSA ELA Data. 3rd grade had 66% of students scoring below a level 3. 4th grade had 34% of students scoring below a level 3. 5th grade had 36% of students scoring below a level 3. Data showed that 3rd grade was well below 50% scoring a level 3. This data showed that there was a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade-appropriate standards. Students were not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks, and teachers need additional support in effective teaching methods to support learning at the proficiency level especially as it relates to new BEST standards in ELA.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Proficiency in ELA will be at or above 50% as measured by the FAST assessments (STAR) by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Proficiency in ELA will be at or above 50% as measured by the FAST assessments (Cambium) by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

1. Data review of iReady and FAST Assessments
2. Leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to collect data on implementation of instruction planned during PLCs and student learning outcomes.
3. Leadership team will use walkthrough data to tier teachers based on established criteria and identify

support needed.
4. Documentation will consist of collaborative planning documents and student formative and summative outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Wilson , Amy , awilson@hardee.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Evidence-based programs will be HMH Reading, Saxon Phonics, and Magnetic workbooks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The evidence-based programs address the identified needs and are aligned with the BEST ELA standards. These programs or companies have proven track records.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
*Ensure teachers have a clear understanding of the K-5 BEST ELA standards *Increase teacher knowledge of evidence-based practices of Reading *Identify students not meeting or making progress to benchmark targets during the school year and provide targeted instruction *Engage in ongoing professional development on the implementation of evidence-based programs	Wilson , Amy , awilson@hardee.k12.fl.us

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 school culture and environment.

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.