

Polk County Public Schools

# Walter Caldwell Elementary School



## 2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>14</b> |

## Walter Caldwell Elementary School

141 DAIRY RD, Auburndale, FL 33823

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/caldwell>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2017-18 Title I School | 2017-18 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|---|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 98%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white<br>on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 60%   |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | D       | D       | D       | D*      |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

Caldwell Elementary will provide high levels of effective instruction along with social and emotional learning that enables students to achieve proficiency of state standards.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

At Caldwell Elementary, our students will achieve grade level mastery and be empowered to grow physically, socially and emotionally.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name                   | Title                    |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Hill, Cheryl           | Principal                |
| Ashmore, Kathryn       | Assistant Principal      |
| Sylvester, Christopher | Instructional Coach      |
| Pittman, Sherry        | Instructional Coach      |
| Swartz, Kimberly       | Teacher, K-12            |
| Irwin, Tamesia         | Instructional Media      |
| Higgins, Megan         | Teacher, ESE             |
| Taylor, Nicole         | Instructional Technology |
| Chisholm, Renne        | School Counselor         |

#### Duties

##### Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Each member of Caldwell Elementary's leadership team

- works to ensure a focus on learning and continuous improvement is maintained.
- serves as an ambassador of the school's mission, vision, core values and instructional focus
- works collaboratively with the principal to regularly review data, refine/revise instructional goals, share ideas and input
- works with the principal to identify students with critical needs in order to provide support
- builds the capacity of the school to address parent, staff and student concerns
- plays an important role in school-based decision-making

In addition, the instructional coaches provide support, resources and professional development to teachers in ELA and Math. They facilitate the disaggregation of student data and collaborate with teachers to assist with planning and instruction.

The guidance counselor serves as a liaison between the school and various agencies to support the social-emotional and academic aspects of our students. The counselor connects families to the necessary resources to support their emotional and physical well-being.

## Early Warning Systems

### Year 2017-18

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 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 19          | 21 | 28 | 19 | 22 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 133   |
| One or more suspensions         | 1           | 4  | 2  | 8  | 10 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 40    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 4           | 0  | 2  | 0  | 1  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 15 | 25 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 70    |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 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     | 3           | 0 | 0 | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0           | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |

Date this data was collected

Sunday 7/22/2018

### Year 2016-17 - 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 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 23          | 21 | 18 | 22 | 15 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 116   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0  | 5  | 3  | 3  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 36          | 31 | 36 | 42 | 21 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 203   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 20 | 41 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 101   |
|                                 | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |

Year 2016-17 - 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 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 23          | 21 | 18 | 22 | 15 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 116   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0  | 5  | 3  | 3  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 36          | 31 | 36 | 42 | 21 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 203   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 20 | 41 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 101   |
|                                 | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

Math proficiency (39%) of our students were the lowest of all data components. For the past three years, the proficiency and learning gains (overall and lowest quartile) have been lower than the district and state averages. of the overall learning gain and learning gains among the lowest quartile in math are the lowest data component as evidenced by our data. Both these scores are well below the district and state averages. Science proficiency scores are much

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

The overall learning gains for math (30%) showed the greatest decline from the overall learning gains for the prior year (36%).

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

The overall learning gains for math (30%) had a 29% gap when compared to the state average (59%).

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

The ELA proficiency for 5th-grade students showed the most improvement. 2018 - 41%; 2017 - 29%. This increase in proficiency must continue in order be considered a trend,

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.**

Differentiating instruction, small group instruction, the use of paraprofessionals to support instruction and the reading interventionist supporting the instruction

**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      | 2018   |          |       | 2017   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 40%    | 50%      | 56%   | 34%    | 48%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 46%    | 51%      | 55%   | 39%    | 49%      | 52%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 45%    | 45%      | 48%   | 33%    | 42%      | 46%   |
| Math Achievement            | 39%    | 58%      | 62%   | 41%    | 54%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 30%    | 56%      | 59%   | 41%    | 52%      | 58%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 34%    | 44%      | 47%   | 37%    | 41%      | 46%   |
| Science Achievement         | 30%    | 53%      | 55%   | 27%    | 46%      | 51%   |

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         |         |         |         | Total     |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1       | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       |           |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 19 (23)                           | 21 (21) | 28 (18) | 19 (22) | 22 (15) | 24 (17) | 133 (116) |
| One or more suspensions         | 1 (0)                             | 4 (0)   | 2 (5)   | 8 (3)   | 10 (3)  | 15 (2)  | 40 (13)   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 4 (36)                            | 0 (31)  | 2 (36)  | 0 (42)  | 1 (21)  | 1 (37)  | 8 (203)   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 15 (20) | 25 (41) | 30 (40) | 70 (101)  |

**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                    | 2018 | 41%    | 51%      | -10%                       | 57%   | -16%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 47%    | 53%      | -6%                        | 58%   | -11%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -6%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 36%    | 48%      | -12%                       | 56%   | -20%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 45%    | 51%      | -6%                        | 56%   | -11%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -11%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 41%    | 50%      | -9%                        | 55%   | -14%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 29%    | 44%      | -15%                       | 53%   | -24%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 12%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -4%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2018 | 53%    | 56%      | -3%                        | 62%   | -9%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 53%    | 58%      | -5%                        | 62%   | -9%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 28%    | 57%      | -29%                       | 62%   | -34%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 33%    | 60%      | -27%                       | 64%   | -31%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -25%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 30%    | 56%      | -26%                       | 61%   | -31%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 32%    | 47%      | -15%                       | 57%   | -25%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2018 | 29%    | 51%      | -22%                       | 55%   | -26%                    |
|                   | 2017 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data

| 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                                       | 16       | 22     | 27          | 14        | 15      | 20           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 27       | 55     | 69          | 36        | 31      | 50           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 30       | 41     | 47          | 31        | 30      | 44           | 5        |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 40       | 50     | 50          | 37        | 26      | 33           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 45       | 41     | 39          | 44        | 30      | 29           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 39       | 49     | 49          | 38        | 31      | 35           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 13       | 26     | 31          | 23        | 30      | 38           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 35       | 41     | 58          | 34        | 44      | 50           | 11       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 29       | 49     | 42          | 35        | 40      | 36           | 14       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 46       | 48     | 58          | 38        | 36      | 29           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 43       | 41     | 22          | 42        | 32      | 38           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 33       | 41     | 42          | 33        | 32      | 28           | 19       |         |           |                   |                     |



### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

#### Areas of Focus:

| Activity #1                          |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Title</b>                         | Attendance   |
| <b>Rationale</b>                     | School attendance is critical to a student's academic success. Students that are chronically absent from school miss important instructional time and learning. Missing even one day can make it hard for students to catch up as what they learn tomorrow builds on what they learned today. Currently, 22% of students at Caldwell Elementary are chronically absent.  |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>              | Caldwell Elementary will improve student attendance by decreasing the number of students absences that miss 10 or more days by 17%.  |
| <b>Point Person</b>                  | Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)  |
| <b>Action Step</b>                   |  |
| <b>Description</b>                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The leadership team will analyze attendance data and identify all incoming students with 10 or more absences from the previous school year.</li> <li>• Each targeted student will have a member of the leadership team and/or an elective teacher to serve as an "attendance mentor" 4:1 ratio.</li> <li>• Attendance mentors will connect with their mentees a minimum of three times per week, through one-on-one meetings, small groups, before/after schools greetings, etc.</li> <li>• Teachers will make personal calls to families of at-risk students if a student is absent two or more days in a month.</li> <li>• Students with perfect attendance and those missing two days or less will be rewarded through drawings, prizes, certificates, etc.</li> <li>• Daily attendance and tardy data will be posted in the front office and outside (yard sign) as an additional means to communicate with families.</li> <li>• Students and parents will sign an attendance and engagement agreement.</li> <li>• Attendance recognition given to classrooms and parents.</li> <li>• Open-house presentation to parents and families about absences.</li> <li>• School-wide Attendance Incentives specific for K-2 (TBD) and 3-5(NBA Basketball Game)</li> <li>• Any student present for 95% or more days will be invited to the Black Top Party – every 9 weeks.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>            | Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)  |
| <b>Plan to Monitor Effectiveness</b> |  |
| <b>Description</b>                   | <p>To monitor the effectiveness of our plan, we will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• analyze attendance data (total # of days absent) monthly and discuss findings at Leadership team, grade level, and faculty meetings to garner any additional suggestions or interventions.</li> <li>• update the list of targeted students each month.</li> <li>• use notes and feedback from "attendance mentors".</li> <li>• examine the number of students attending the Black Top Party each 9-weeks to identify any trends.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>            | Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)  |

| Activity #2             |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Title</b>            | Learning Gains - ELA and Math  |
| <b>Rationale</b>        | Overall learning gains in ELA and Math continue below the district and State averages, Specifically, in math, overall learning gains were 30% with the learning gains for the bottom quartile 34%. The ELA overall learning gains were 46% with the learning gains for the bottom quartile were 45%.   |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b> | We will identify our bottom quartile students in both ELA and math based on FSA scores, STAR progress monitoring data and formative assessments and target instruction based on student needs to increase the overall learning gains and learning gains of the lowest quartile by 10% in both ELA and Math.  |
| <b>Point Person</b>     | Cheryl Hill (cheryl.hill@polk-fl.net)  |
| <b>Action Step</b>      |  |
| <b>Description</b>      | <p>We will improve learning gains in both ELA and Math by providing rigorous standards-based instruction, utilizing the district curriculum maps an resources. Instructional coaches and administrators will guide teachers in the continuous practice/cycle of analyzing formative assessments, weekly and quarterly, to revise/refine and target instruction based on student needs during PLCs. Classroom walk-throughs and observations will be used for both coaching and evaluations in an effort to identify to the instructional supports needs by the teachers. PLC topics and professional development will be generated from this data and used to identify coaching needs to build capacity within the teachers.</p>   |
|                         | <p>-During Data Day and PLCs, teachers will analyze individual classroom assessment data to identify points needed for learning gains and proficiency levels for each of their students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teachers will utilize the district curriculum maps and provide standards-based instruction.</li> <li>- Teachers will utilize PLC's to focus groups based on the data and gaps from formative assessments</li> <li>- Administrative team/Coaches use weekly PLCs to analyze student formative assessment data and</li> </ul> <p>revise/refine instruction as needed to provide targeted interventions. Karen Bailey will lead PD for teachers to learn how to create assessments and track student growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use Istation and STAR data to form students small groups in the classroom for the purpose of reteaching skills and extending/enriching lessons.</li> <li>- Teachers will participate in professional development from LSI Essentials for Achieving Rigor.</li> <li>- The entire staff will participate in a book study "Creating Conditions for Rigorous Instruction" by Jennifer Cleary, Terry Morgan, and Robert Marzano.</li> <li>-Use formative assessments to differentiate instruction for extension and remediation.</li> <li>-Implement daily math fact fluency practice.</li> <li>-use flexible grouping based assessment data for each unit of instruction</li> <li>- consistently use instructional strategies that require all students to make their thinking visible</li> <li>- Instructional staff(5) will attend Eric Jensen Summer Conference (Out of State)</li> <li>- Use Florida Ready materials (Reading/Math) for extended learning</li> <li>- Paraprofessionals will be used to provide tutoring to students in small groups during math,</li> </ul> |

reading and/or  
science instruction.

- The reading interventionist will push into classrooms and provide instructional support to our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.
- The use of effective research-based, high yield strategies/resources that include LSI and Istation will support the planning and delivery of instruction for whole groups and small groups.

**Person Responsible** Cheryl Hill (cheryl.hill@polk-fl.net)

#### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description**

1. Teachers will meet in PLCs to discuss students data to collaborate and plan for instruction.
2. The School-based leadership team will meet bi-weekly to use school-wide instructional data, (STAR, I-station, etc to review individual student instructional trends and needs.
3. Observations and Walk-throughs and feedback will be used to monitor the implementation of instructional strategies, professional development needs of teachers and to drive the topics for PLCs.
4. STAR and I-Station data will be used to monitor student progress towards the proficiency of standards and growth.
5. Weekly assessments will be used to measure student growth and progress towards learning targets.

**Person Responsible** Cheryl Hill (cheryl.hill@polk-fl.net)

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

Please see attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for full details on how we plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

#### PFEP Link

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

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

Due to the relationships that the classroom teacher and support staff have established, they are able to identify the social-emotional needs of their students. Social Skills are explicitly taught to the student each

day on the CBT morning news show. Teachers have skills posters that detail steps to follow for key skills such as: accepting no, dealing with anger, ignoring distractions etc.

We will utilize the Sanford Harmony Social Emotional Learning program to teach Social and Emotional Skills to students. The goal of Harmony is to incorporate specialized teaching strategies into classroom activities—from preschool through sixth grade—in an effort to reduce bullying and help develop the youth of today into tolerant, compassionate, and caring adults for the future. We also utilize strategies from Teaching and Engaging Students in Poverty by Eric Jensen.

SHINE is mentoring program that Caldwell has implemented for students who are in need of extra emotional resources. We have partnered with Auburndale High School and local community members and business partners to mentor our students. The mentors meet with students once a week and complete various activities. The activities are focused on Being Prepared, Acting Responsibly, Exhibiting Self-Control, Respecting Everyone and Showing Kindness.

For students who need additional support, Caldwell utilizes the Check-In system. Assigned staff members can check-in on specific students or students can check-in with staff members. The staff member becomes an anchor for the student in need.

Behavioral trackers with built-in breaks and rewards are used for students who need Tier 2 or Tier 3 social-emotional or behavioral interventions.

The Guidance Counselor provides counseling for students. Caldwell also partners with Winter Haven Hospital to provide Mental Health Counseling to students who have it identified on either IEPs or 504 Plans.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

Our Pre-K teachers coordinate with our kindergarten teachers to facilitate a smooth transition from Pre-K to Kindergarten. In Pre-K, students are taught appropriate academics in the area of language arts and math. Pre-K students are also taught our school-wide procedures for managing student behavior. This combination of academic and school-wide procedures prepares our students for a smooth transition to Kindergarten. School Readiness students are assessed by the teacher with an Ages and Stages instrument that coincides with their chronological age as well as the Child Observation Record form. These are then made a part of the student's portfolio. The curriculum used is based on High Scope, Beyond Centers and Circle Time; both of which are age appropriate to our students. The funding is received through District School Readiness, Operational Budget and Federal Funds through district Child Find.

Pre-School parents have the opportunity to attend all school-wide functions. Daily communication is conducted between teacher and parent through a daily letter home. Monthly newsletters are sent to parents reviewing the past month's activities and informing parents of the upcoming month.

Kindergarten teachers provide an on-site screening for beginning kindergartners prior to school beginning. The students rotate to each teacher to perform an activity. This gives teachers and students a chance to interact as well as an opportunity for the students to visit the kindergarten classrooms. Parents and students also have an opportunity to meet their child's teacher at Orientation before school starts. Weekly newsletters are sent home. At the beginning of the year, teachers provide a "field trip" to a different area each day. Students are taken to the cafeteria, library, office, music room, art room, PE field, etc. to familiarize students with our school campus.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

Based on student achievement data, the administrative team identifies the areas of need and uses Title One Funds to help purchase additional support staff. A Literacy Coach and Math Coach were hired to work with instructional staff to strengthen Language Arts and Math instruction. A Reading Interventionist was hired to strategically work with Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Three instructional paras have been hired to assist small group tutoring for students in grades K-5. The paras provide tutoring during Language Arts, Math and/or science instruction.

Title 1, Part A funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. This program supports after-school and summer instructional programs, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, technology for students, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III to ensure that staff development needs are addressed accordingly.

Title II Professional Development resources are available to all schools through Title II funds. In addition, School Technology Services provides technical support, technology training, and licenses for software programs and web-based access via Title II-D funds as made available.

Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners and their teachers in Title 1 schools, as well as professional learning opportunities for school staff.

The Hearth Program, funded through Title IX, provides support for identified homeless students. Title 1 provides additional support for this program, and many activities implemented by the Hearth program are carried out in cooperation with the Migrant Education Program (MEP) funded through Title, Part C.

Head Start provides resources to assist students in the transition from pre-k to kindergarten.

Title I, UniSIG provides additional funds to help support strategies and actions steps identified in the school's SIP.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

Career inventories will be used at all grade levels to help students identify skills and interests for college and career planning.

## Part V: Budget

Total:

\$295,117.50