

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Walden Lake Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Walden Lake Elementary School

2800 TURKEY CREEK RD, Plant City, FL 33566

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Troy Smith**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/22/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (51%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

## Walden Lake Elementary School

2800 TURKEY CREEK RD, Plant City, FL 33566

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	57%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

### School Grades History

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

### 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.

We will provide a safe and positive learning environment to ensure a quality education for all students.

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

Together, we will do what it takes to make a difference.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smith, Troy	Principal	Instructional Leader at Walden Lake Elementary School
Hudson, Lori	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 6/22/2020, Troy Smith

**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.*

4

**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.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

62

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5

<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (51%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:



Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	126	124	138	107	138	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	761
Attendance below 90 percent	10	10	14	11	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	25	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

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

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

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

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

#### Prior Year - As Reported

#### The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	138	143	111	139	139	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	809
Attendance below 90 percent	15	21	4	15	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	36	18	21	10	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	30	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

#### 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	8	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

#### 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	4	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**Prior Year - Updated****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	138	143	111	139	139	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	809
Attendance below 90 percent	15	21	4	15	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	36	18	21	10	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	30	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

**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	8	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

**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	4	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data**

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	66%	52%	57%	57%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	55%	58%	53%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	50%	53%	36%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	60%	54%	63%	53%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	57%	62%	45%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	46%	51%	31%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	50%	53%	52%	48%	51%

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

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	52%	11%	58%	5%
	2018	61%	53%	8%	57%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
	2018	61%	55%	6%	56%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
	2018	56%	51%	5%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	54%	3%	62%	-5%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	57%	8%	64%	1%
	2018	66%	57%	9%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	53%	54%	-1%	60%	-7%
	2018	60%	54%	6%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	51%	11%	53%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	66%	52%	14%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						

### Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	34	57	60	25	44	38	22				
ELL	47	58	65	44	55	60	29				
BLK	38	71	80	16	45	58	40				
HSP	60	60	67	52	54	48	56				
MUL	64	42		57	25						
WHT	73	68	55	70	61	31	74				
FRL	55	64	60	46	50	43	53				
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	36	58	54	38	68	62	42				
ELL	39	42	31	38	51	44	37				
ASN	100			83							
BLK	37	31		29	47						
HSP	56	61	38	49	63	51	57				
MUL	73			73							
WHT	68	62	56	71	76	58	76				
FRL	51	53	43	48	59	52	62				
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	24	34	21	25	34	19	25				
ELL	18	35	38	21	42	35	10				
ASN	82			73							
BLK	25	47		21	33						
HSP	43	45	36	39	40	33	37				
MUL	67	75		67	42						
WHT	68	55	25	62	49	29	66				
FRL	41	46	32	37	41	32	37				

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
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	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57

Hispanic Students	
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	47
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Math Gains from Bottom Quartile - Data from 18-19 school year. 5 new teachers to the grade level in 5th.

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

Overall math gains and gains from math bottom quartile (-12). 5 new teachers on the fifth grade team.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

Math bottom quartile. Data from 18-19 school year.

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

ELA Bottom quartile gains. Reading data chats, coaching, and planning.

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

Attendance

Number of students scoring level 1 on FSA

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

1. Learning gains of math bottom quartile
2. Overall math learning gains
3. Overall math achievement
4. Learning gains of ELA bottom quartile
5. Attendance

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Consistent interventions and math progress monitoring, especially with the math bottom quartile.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	62% of the students identified as being in the bottom quartile for math will show learning gains.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Troy Smith (troy.smith@hcps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Purposeful planning, coaching, and reflecting on data.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Best practices. PLC driven.

#### Action Steps to Implement

- Collaborate with district math coach to understand areas needed for support

**Person Responsible** Troy Smith (troy.smith@hcps.net)

- Grade level PLC's and data chats to monitor student performance and adjust as needed

**Person Responsible** Troy Smith (troy.smith@hcps.net)

- Purposeful planning to target top and bottom quartiles

**Person Responsible** Troy Smith (troy.smith@hcps.net)

- Self-paced PD trainings to enhance content knowledge

**Person Responsible** Troy Smith (troy.smith@hcps.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

- Active PTA
- Family learning nights
- Newsletters
- Parentlink
- Parent/teacher conferences
- Survey data

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00