

The School District of Lee County

Caloosa Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 19 |

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: 9/20/2021

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* 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%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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 | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 19 |

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>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">93%</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;">59%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| Grade | | B | B | 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 | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| LaMar, Ashley | Principal | |
| Metzger, Stephanie | Assistant Principal | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, 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.*

6

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

908

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

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

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 133 | 162 | 150 | 153 | 154 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 908 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 32 | 13 | 21 | 19 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 14 | 8 | 17 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 22 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 24 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 10 | 5 | 12 | 21 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |

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 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 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 |

2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 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 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 70% | 57% | 57% | 67% | 55% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 63% | 56% | 58% | 67% | 53% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 56% | 50% | 53% | 61% | 47% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 63% | 62% | 63% | 70% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 61% | 65% | 62% | 63% | 59% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 43% | 54% | 51% | 53% | 46% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 65% | 52% | 53% | 64% | 54% | 55% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 58% | 11% | 58% | 11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 66% | 55% | 11% | 58% | 8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -69% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 71% | 54% | 17% | 56% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -66% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 67% | 61% | 6% | 62% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 62% | -10% | 64% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -67% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 67% | 58% | 9% | 60% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 50% | 14% | 53% | 11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady, and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 3/18.8 | 1/6.7 | 0/0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 |
| | English Language Learners | 3/18.8 | 1/6.7 | 0/0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 12/11.8 | 37/34.9 | 0/0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0 | 1/11.1 | 0/0 |
| | English Language Learners | 1/6.7 | 2/14.3 | 0/0 |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 1/7.1 | 3/21.4 | 1/10 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1/7.1 | 2/14.3 | 1/7.1 |
| | English Language Learners | 1/7.1 | 3/21.4 | 1/10 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 8/6.6 | 34/26 | 0/0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0 | 1/7.1 | 0/0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 2/14.3 | 2/14.3 | 1/10 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1/6.7 | 1/6.7 | 1/6.3 |
| | English Language Learners | 2/14.3 | 2/14.3 | 1/7.7 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 12/8.8 | 45/31.3 | 73/50 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0 | 1/6.7 | 0/0 |
| | English Language Learners | 1/7.1 | 1/7.1 | 3/23.1 |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 0/0 | 1/9.1 | 0/0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/10.5 | 3/15.8 | 2/11.1 |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0 | 1/9.1 | 0/0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 22/15.5 | 51/34.9 | 69/46.6 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 |
| | English Language Learners | 1/9.1 | 1/9.1 | 0/0 |

| Grade 5 | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | 0/0 | 0/0 | 2/20 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 1/6.3 | 3/18.8 | 3/18.8 |
| | English Language Learners | | 0/0 | 0/0 | 2/20 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 15/10.3 | 64/42.4 | 79/53.7 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 0/0 | 2/15.3 | 5/33.3 |
| | English Language Learners | | 0/0 | 2/22.2 | 3/30 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | | 37/25 | 77/52 | 92/64.8 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 1/7.7 | 3/23.1 | 7/70 |
| | English Language Learners | | 0/0 | 0/0 | 4/40 |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 11 | 29 | 40 | 17 | 50 | | 30 | | | | |
| ELL | 37 | | | 49 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 44 | 25 | | 56 | 50 | | 29 | | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 63 | 50 | 64 | 52 | 50 | 63 | | | | |
| MUL | 57 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | 62 | 53 | 69 | 63 | 56 | 59 | | | | |
| FRL | 57 | 55 | 35 | 62 | 51 | 29 | 51 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |

| 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 |
| 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 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 58 |
| 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 | 63 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 467 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 94% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 33 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 50 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 41 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 59 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 61 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 61 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 51 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Caloosa Elementary has seen steady performance throughout the pandemic over the last two school years. There were some modest decreases across all grade levels and subgroups in ELA. Conversely, there were some modest increases across grade levels and subgroups in math.

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

The greatest opportunity for improvement is in ELA. Caloosa Elementary is at the same performance level as 2018 with 62% proficient; however, we were at 70% proficient at the end of the 2019 school year. Also, learning gains with the L25 subgroup dipped below 50% (49%).

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

Many of the students were quarantined for several days at a time last year as well as many students received instruction via Lee Home Connect. This is a great alternative but cannot replace face to face instruction with a highly qualified, highly effective teacher. Also, the online learning significantly reduced the opportunity for authentic engagement and cooperative learning.

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

The most improvement was shown in mathematics, both in overall proficiency and learning gains for the students in the L25 subgroup.

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

We implemented an intentional focus on math intervention and had extra support during the day specifically for students struggling with math.

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

Small group, standards based instruction that is specifically targeted to what students need.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Our math coaches model lessons for teachers and also observe them to provide coaching. Our leading and learning specialists are the point people for the latest information related to teaching and learning.

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

In school interventions as well as tutoring/homework help in our after school program will continue.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SWD subgroup was identified because this group is below the 41% Proficiency rate (latest data is at 37% proficient).

Measurable Outcome: The SWD subgroup will improve to 44% proficiency for the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring: 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.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: 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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies are evidence based strategies that yield a high effect size and have been peer reviewed in multiple studies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Progress monitoring through iReady 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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SWD subgroup was identified because this group is below the 41% Proficiency rate (latest data is at 37% proficient).

Measurable Outcome: The SWD subgroup will improve to 70% learning gains for the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring: 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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stephanie Metzger (stephanieme@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: 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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies are evidence based strategies that yield a high effect size and have been peer reviewed in multiple studies.

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 Stephanie Metzger (stephanieme@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Caloosa Elementary discipline data compared to other schools is excellent. Caloosa has a strong, positive school culture where most employees have worked at the school for 10+ years. We are a model PBIS school where staff has input and buy-in to ensure that school is safe, fun, and enjoyable for everyone.

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.

See documents

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

See documents

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |