

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

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	93%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

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				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	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
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	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
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	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