

The School District of Lee County

Caloosa Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Caloosa Elementary School

620 DEL PRADO BLVD S, Cape Coral, FL 33990

<http://coe.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Ashley Lamar

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Lee 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Caloosa Elementary School

620 DEL PRADO BLVD S, Cape Coral, FL 33990

<http://coe.leeschools.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">84%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">57%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

Caloosa Elementary's mission is to ensure that each student achieves his/her greatest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Caloosa Elementary's vision is to be a school of excellence.

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
LaMar, Ashley	Principal	Attend PLCs, monitor student data, coach teachers on best practices related to teacher/student engagement, make sure teachers have resources needed to be successful
Page, Gay	Other	Attend PLCs, monitor student data, coach teachers on best practices related to teacher/student engagement, make sure teachers have resources needed to be successful
Heller, Robyn	Instructional Coach	Attend PLCs, monitor student data, coach teachers on best practices related to teacher/student engagement, make sure teachers have resources needed to be successful
Algernon, Marcel	School Counselor	Attend PLCs, monitor student data, coach teachers on best practices related to teacher/student engagement, make sure teachers have resources needed to be successful
Duron, Michael	Instructional Coach	Attend PLCs, monitor student data, coach teachers on best practices related to teacher/student engagement, make sure teachers have resources needed to be successful
Metzger, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Ashley Lamar

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.*

7

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	131	128	123	145	146	171	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	844
Attendance below 90 percent	10	2	7	18	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	7	6	5	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	1	4	1	6	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	1	4	3	4	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 10/24/2020

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	143	139	136	165	168	151	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	902
Attendance below 90 percent	17	14	14	10	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	3	2	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	16	17	8	11	20	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	27	42	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	7	9	3	12	22	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	2	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	143	139	136	165	168	151	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	902
Attendance below 90 percent	17	14	14	10	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	3	2	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	16	17	8	11	20	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	27	42	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	7	9	3	12	22	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	2	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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

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	70%	57%	57%	62%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	56%	58%	64%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	50%	53%	62%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	63%	62%	63%	71%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	65%	62%	75%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	54%	51%	58%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	52%	53%	58%	51%	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	69%	58%	11%	58%	11%
	2018	66%	55%	11%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	55%	11%	58%	8%
	2018	63%	53%	10%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	71%	54%	17%	56%	15%
	2018	68%	52%	16%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	67%	61%	6%	62%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	73%	58%	15%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	62%	-10%	64%	-12%
	2018	60%	58%	2%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
05	2019	67%	58%	9%	60%	7%
	2018	71%	57%	14%	61%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	64%	50%	14%	53%	11%
	2018	62%	52%	10%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	33	43	41	39	36	28	40				
ELL	48	67	55	52	48						
BLK	63	50	57	60	63	60	50				
HSP	67	60	48	60	57	36	56				
MUL	67			67							
WHT	75	67	65	65	64	44	75				
FRL	63	58	46	59	59	43	62				

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	25	47	48	36	51	45	33				
ELL	29			50							
ASN	67			92							
BLK	37	63		48	63						
HSP	66	65	60	71	64	56	58				
MUL	56	50		65	55						
WHT	73	71	61	71	63	48	68				
FRL	63	64	60	66	59	50	58				

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	22	60	61	42	67	58	29				
ELL	33	75	85	56	80	83	18				
ASN	67			83							
BLK	45	50		59	57						
HSP	58	65	65	65	70	60	46				
MUL	50	50		57	60						
WHT	69	65	60	78	81	58	69				
FRL	57	64	61	68	72	63	58				

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)	TS&I
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
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	58
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	56
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	67
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	65
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.

Caloosa decreased in FSA Math proficiency in 2018-2019 (70% in 2018 to 63% in 2019). This was our component of lowest performance at 63% proficient and only 44% of our L25 making learning gains.

Factors that may have contributed to the decline in math scores were the major focus on ELA for the 18-19 school year and the master schedule not allowing for extended intervention in math instruction.

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

Caloosa decreased by 10 percent (53% in 2018 to 43% in 2019) in learning gains on FSA Math performance for the lowest 25%- specifically, 4th grade .

Factors that may have contributed to the decline of L25 math scores were a new 4th grade teacher for the ESE/L25 class (that did not have prior elementary experience) and limited support from the math coach (due to scheduling). Also, the master schedule did not allow for extended intervention in math.

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.

4th grade math performance had the greatest gap (-12 points) when compared to the state average. All other grade levels exceeded the state average. This appears to be a one year issue for 4th grade, as the previous years performance for 4th grade met or exceeded the state average.

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

Caloosa had an increase in FSA ELA overall proficiency of 3% (70% in 2019 compared to 67% in 2018). This was our biggest gain. Our master schedule allowed for uninterrupted reading and intervention blocks, our reading coach provided valuable professional development in high yield strategies that were implemented into the classroom, administration completed walk throughs to ensure HY strategies were in place, and the reading coach and teacher pushed into classrooms where students needed extra help.

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

Our biggest area of concern is the lack of learning gains in our L25 Math scores (43% in 2019). These students need remediation and support to be successful.

Our next area of concern is math achievement overall. We dropped 7 percent in math proficiency from last year

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

1. Increase overall Math proficiency (Goal is 71% proficiency for 2020)
2. Increase Math learning gains in L25 (Goal is 66% for 2020)
3. Increase overall ELA proficiency (Goal is 73% for 2020)
4. Increase ELA learning gains in L25 (Goal is 66% for 2020)
5. Increase overall Science proficiency (Goal is 70% for 2020)
6. Increase proficiency for SWD (Goal is 45% for 2020)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The 2019 achievement rate was 63%. When looking at the percentage of students who are at achievement or just below achievement (2b) the percentage increases to 71%. Proficiency in Math at the elementary level is one of the top indicators of success in both middle and high school. Historically within the Lee County School District, over 90% of students who leave elementary school with a Math Achievement Level of Level 3 or higher graduate high school. Students who leave elementary school at Achievement Level 2 have graduated about 50% of the time, and students who leave elementary school with a Math Achievement Level 1 graduate around 15% of the time. It is evident, based upon the historical data, that the primary years are critical for building a solid foundation for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase the percentage of students in grades 3-5 proficient in Math from 63% to 71% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley LaMar (ashleyal@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Focus on mastery of standards and what students need to be successful. Schedule students into groups based upon their mastery of the standards being taught. Teachers will develop lesson plans that are rigorous and ambitious, using all relevant formative data to address any areas of deficiency. Teachers will continue to implement Quality Practices, such as data binders, student reflection on data, student self reflection and goal setting, individual student goals, class goals, and grade level goals. High Yield strategies will be discussed and studied in depth during PLCs and grade level meetings. Root Cause Analyses will be conducted a minimum of one time per month to examine correlations between instructional practices and student performance data. Correlations between grades and STAR performance will be conducted every progress monitoring period to determine if daily

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

student work (assignments, class assessments, etc.) match the level of rigor required for success on STAR and FSA.

Focus on mastery of standards and what students need to be successful.

Schedule students into groups based upon their mastery of the standards being taught. Teachers will develop lesson plans that are rigorous and ambitious, using all relevant formative data to address any areas of deficiency. Teachers will continue to implement Quality Practices, such as data binders, student reflection on data, student self reflection and goal setting, individual student goals, class goals, and grade level goals. High Yield strategies will be discussed and studied in depth during PLCs and grade level meetings. Root Cause Analyses will be conducted a minimum of one time per month to examine correlations between instructional practices and student performance data. Correlations between grades and STAR performance will be conducted every progress monitoring period to determine if daily student work (assignments, class assessments, etc.) match the level of rigor required for success on STAR and FSA

Action Steps to Implement

1. Progress monitoring through STAR and standards based TAG reports in Compass
2. Classroom observation of implementation of action steps.
3. Administrative attendance at grade level planning meetings and PLCs.
4. Administrative overview and review of lesson plans.
5. Administrative data chats and monitoring of data dashboards

Person Responsible

Ashley LaMar (ashleyal@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In 2017-2018, ELA Achievement for SWD was 25%. In 2018-2019, Achievement increased to 33%. In 2017-2018, Math Achievement for SWD was 36%. In 2018-2019, Achievement increased to 39%. Proficiency in Math at the elementary level is one of the top indicators of success in both middle and high school. Historically within the Lee County School District, over 90% of students who leave elementary school with a Math Achievement Level of Level 3 or higher graduate high school. Students who leave elementary school at Achievement Level 2 have graduated about 50% of the time, and students who leave elementary school with a Math Achievement Level 1 graduate around 15% of the time. It is evident, based upon the historical data, that the primary years are critical for building a solid foundation for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the percentage of SWD in grades 3-5 Achievement in ELA from 33% to 43% and Math from 39% to 49% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ashley LaMar (ashleyal@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Focus on mastery of standards and what students need to be successful. Schedule students into groups based upon their mastery of the standards being taught. Teachers will develop lesson plans that are rigorous and ambitious, using all relevant formative data to address any areas of deficiency. Teachers will continue to implement Quality Practices, such as data binders, student reflection on data, student self reflection and goal setting, individual student goals, class goals, and grade level goals. High Yield strategies will be discussed and studied in depth during PLCs and grade level meetings. Root Cause Analyses will be conducted a minimum of one time per month to examine correlations between instructional practices and student performance data. Correlations between grades and STAR performance will be conducted every progress monitoring period to determine if daily student work (assignments, class assessments, etc.) match the level of rigor required for success on STAR and FSA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Focus on mastery of standards and what students need to be successful. Schedule students into groups based upon their mastery of the standards being taught. Teachers will develop lesson plans that are rigorous and ambitious, using all relevant formative data to address any areas of deficiency. Teachers will continue to implement Quality Practices, such as data binders, student reflection on data, student self reflection and goal setting, individual student goals, class goals, and grade level goals. High Yield strategies will be discussed and studied in depth during PLCs and grade level meetings. Root Cause Analyses will be conducted a minimum of one time per month to examine correlations between instructional practices and student performance data. Correlations between grades and STAR performance will be conducted every progress monitoring period to determine if daily student work (assignments, class assessments, etc.) match the level of rigor required for success on STAR and FSA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Progress monitoring through STAR and standards based TAG reports in Compass
2. Classroom observation of implementation of action steps.
3. Administrative attendance at grade level planning meetings and PLCs.
4. Administrative overview and review of lesson plans.
5. Administrative data chats and monitoring of data dashboards

Person Responsible Ashley LaMar (ashleyal@leeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

<p>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</p>	<p>56% of disciplinary referrals were for disruptive behavior. These incidents of student misconduct create a disruption to the learning environment and impact all students.</p>
<p>Measurable Outcome:</p>	<p>Caloosa Elementary will have a 15% reduction in disciplinary referrals. Through PBS and Restorative Justice, the percentage of referrals for disruption and disrespect will be two key areas of focus.</p>
<p>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</p>	<p>Ashley LaMar (ashleyal@leeschools.net)</p>
<p>Evidence-based Strategy:</p>	<p>The Positive Behavior Supports system will be further implemented for the 2018-2019 school year. PBS Committee will meet two times per month to discuss strategies, interventions, as well as to monitor data to look for areas of strength as well as opportunities for improvement. The committee is comprised of teachers, support personnel, and administration. The committee will plan schedules for school wide recognition of classes as well as individual recognition for students with high needs.</p>
<p>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</p>	<p>The Positive Behavior Supports system will be further implemented for the 2018-2019 school year. PBS Committee will meet two times per month to discuss strategies, interventions, as well as to monitor data to look for areas of strength as well as opportunities for improvement. The committee is comprised of teachers, support personnel, and administration. The committee will plan schedules for school wide recognition of classes as well as individual recognition for students with high needs.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Castle Reports, teacher reports, and referral data will be presented at each meeting.
2. The committee will look at all variables, including, but not limited to, time of day, day of the week, location, grade level, and nature of disciplinary infractions.
3. The team will look for trends or try and determine if an infraction is limited to a few students.
4. The team will brainstorm ideas and try and determine any antecedents that may have helped lead to any infractions and

determine supports that can be implemented to minimize the chances of any future infractions.

Person Responsible Ashley LaMar (ashleyal@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students need to be in school to learn. Schools with the highest levels of achievement also see the highest levels of average daily attendance.

Measurable Outcome: The attendance goal for the 2019-2020 school year is to improve average daily attendance (ADA) to 95% or higher and reduce the percentage of students with chronic absenteeism to 9% or below. In the 2018-2019 school year, 10% of the students had chronic absenteeism.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ashley LaMar (ashleyal@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Admin and social worker will monitor average daily attendance as well as chronic absences. When students reach 5 or more absences/tardies, meetings will be scheduled to develop a plan to improve attendance. Additionally, home visits and phone calls from the social worker and/or admin to encourage attendance will be implemented.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Admin and social worker will monitor average daily attendance as well as chronic absences. When students reach 5 or more absences/tardies, meetings will be scheduled to develop a plan to improve attendance. Additionally, home visits and phone calls from the social worker and/or admin to encourage attendance will be implemented.

Action Steps to Implement

1. CASTLE and Focus reports will be sent via email daily
2. A meeting will be scheduled for admin and social worker to meet once every two weeks to review average attendance as well as looking at individual students with chronic absenteeism.
3. Teachers have been instructed to also monitor attendance and reach out to parents and inform admin/office staff once a student reaches four absences.
4. Classes are rewarded with incentives when the spell "Attendance" (each day the class has perfect attendance, they add a letter until the spell attendance)
5. For individuals with chronic attendance issues, individual incentive plans are developed on a case by case basis

Person Responsible Ashley LaMar (ashleyal@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

SWD subgroup is an area of Focus. Root Cause Analyses will be conducted a minimum of one time per month to examine correlations between instructional practices and student performance data. Correlations between grades and iReady performance will be conducted every progress monitoring period to determine if daily student work (assignments, class assessments, etc.) match the level of rigor required for success on STAR and FSA

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.

The Core Values of LCSD and Caloosa Elementary:

We believe that all students can learn, and staff can perform best in an organization that practices: accountability, responsibility, and transparency, parental and community involvement, data based decision making, differentiated instruction, effective communication, equal opportunity, life-long learning, participatory problem solving, respect for diversity, strategic planning for continuous improvement, visionary leadership, compassion, and integrity.

Caloosa Elementary has a process for review, revision, and communication of its purpose. The process begins in August during our Back To School faculty and staff meetings, during which all personnel engage in conversations about our district's and school's mission and vision for the new school year. During these meetings we also reflect on our values, beliefs, curriculum, standards, educational practices, and the unique needs of our diversified student population. We come to a consensus about our goals, revise the mission and vision statements, and school based practices as needed and resolve to implement our actions with fidelity. We commit to continuous improvement and stay focused on our goals. We engage in professional development trainings and collaborative planning sessions with district and school based teams in order to prepare to jump-start the school year. The conversation continues with parent surveys during Open House in August and during our first month of school as teachers, students, and staff members work to establish expectations, procedures, and routines throughout the school.

The process is formalized on a regular schedule through the Student Advisory Council (SAC). SAC is the driving force behind the Caloosa Elementary school improvement process

and increased student achievement. The School Advisory Council is a school based group intended to represent the school, the community, and those closest to our students. The group shares responsibility for guiding the school process towards continuous improvement

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
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00