

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Walden Lake 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Walden Lake Elementary School

2800 TURKEY CREEK RD, Plant City, FL 33566

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Troy Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 2/11/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
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: B (60%) 2016-17: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Walden Lake Elementary School

2800 TURKEY CREEK RD, Plant City, FL 33566

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	57%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smith, Troy	Principal	Instructional leader Support teacher planning Observations and feedback Scheduling Set goals Drive instruction Track student/school progress
Hudson, Lori	SAC Member	SAC Chair Parent Liaison Support school wide needs Assist with data review, trends, and next steps

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 2/11/2020, Troy Smith

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

850

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

2

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

3

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	126	128	144	102	147	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	779
Attendance below 90 percent	19	18	21	12	25	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	6	6	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/29/2021

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	126	124	138	107	138	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	761
Attendance below 90 percent	10	10	14	11	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	25	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	126	124	138	107	138	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	761
Attendance below 90 percent	10	10	14	11	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	25	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				66%	52%	57%	63%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	55%	58%	60%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	50%	53%	46%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				60%	54%	63%	61%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				57%	57%	62%	69%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	46%	51%	54%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				65%	50%	53%	69%	51%	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	63%	52%	11%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	65%	57%	8%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17	43	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	38	64
	Students With Disabilities	0	14	36
	English Language Learners	0	23	36
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18	35	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	26	56
	Students With Disabilities	13	14	44
	English Language Learners	0	8	29

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	48	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	32	52
	Students With Disabilities	19	37	50
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19	41	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	32	39
	Students With Disabilities	19	43	43
	English Language Learners	4	16	24
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	70	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	64	64
	Students With Disabilities	27	32	24
	English Language Learners	7	43	54
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17	36	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	34	53
	Students With Disabilities	5	23	33
	English Language Learners	13	7	54

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34	44	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	35	40
	Students With Disabilities	34	45	43
	English Language Learners	5	14	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16	33	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	24	55
	Students With Disabilities	24	28	44
	English Language Learners	11	14	43
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	43	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	35	50
	Students With Disabilities	33	52	61
	English Language Learners	0	17	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21	43	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	35	50
	Students With Disabilities	33	52	61
	English Language Learners	0	17	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	21	47	42	38	47	50	37				
ELL	38	63		51	71		52				
BLK	30			43			20				
HSP	50	70		55	63	69	62				
WHT	64	65	65	74	52		63				
FRL	45	57	48	56	52	59	49				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	34	57	60	25	44	38	22				
ELL	47	58	65	44	55	60	29				
BLK	38	71	80	16	45	58	40				
HSP	60	60	67	52	54	48	56				
MUL	64	42		57	25						
WHT	73	68	55	70	61	31	74				
FRL	55	64	60	46	50	43	53				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	36	58	54	38	68	62	42				
ELL	39	42	31	38	51	44	37				
ASN	100			83							
BLK	37	31		29	47						
HSP	56	61	38	49	63	51	57				
MUL	73			73							
WHT	68	62	56	71	76	58	76				
FRL	51	53	43	48	59	52	62				

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	57
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	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	459

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Multiracial Students	
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	64
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	52
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?

- Math tends to be have lower proficiency rates that ELA (all grades except 5th)
- ESE and ELL students tend to have lower proficiency rates in ELA and Math

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

- Overall ELA and Science proficiency
- Math Learning Gains

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 instructional hours lost due to quarantines and isolations
- transitions from elearning to campus

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

- Math bottom quartile learning gains

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

- Math data chats, coaching, and planning

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

- Data driven coaching cycles
- Enhanced standards based planning

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.

- Grade level specific PD and training
- Individualized support through coaching cycles

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

- Teachers will attend the district offered data chats related to monthly and interim assessments to identify standards of focus and next steps for addressing them

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Consistent acceleration through core with instruction focused on grade level standards. Appropriate scaffolding and interventions with individualized instruction and math progress monitoring during small groups.
---	---

Measurable Outcome:	62% of students will be proficient based on end of year assessments. 62% of students will show learning gains by end of year.
----------------------------	---

Monitoring:	Weekly PLCs. Regularly scheduled data conferences with individual teachers.
--------------------	---

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Troy Smith (troy.smith@hcps.net)
---	----------------------------------

Evidence-based Strategy:	Purposeful planning, coaching and reflecting on data
---------------------------------	--

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Best practices. PLC driven.
---	-----------------------------

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborate with district math coach to identify trends and areas of focus. Use math contact as a resource for planning and problem solving.

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

Grade level PLCs with preset agendas to focus on standards and student achievement.

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

Self-paced PD trainings and purposeful planning to enhance content knowledge.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.floridacims.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.

When you compare Walden Lake Elementary to the state data there are not any areas of concern that need to be addressed. We are ranked #1 in suspensions with zero. We are #1 in property and drug incidents with zero. For violent incidents reported, the state average is 1 per 100 students. We are at 1 per 500 students or .2 per 100, well below the state average.

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.

- Active PTA
- Community events
- Business partners/spirit nights
- Parentlinks
- Parent/teacher survey data

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

- Parents (volunteering, conferencing)
- Students (respectful actions, attendance, goal setting)
- Teachers/School staff (high expectations, individual goal setting)

Part V: Budget

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

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