

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Walden Lake Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 2/16/2020

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (60%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	84%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B	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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smith, Troy	Principal	
Hudson, Lori	SAC Member	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 2/16/2020, Troy Smith

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Total number of students enrolled at the school

825

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	153	137	146	150	104	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	825
Attendance below 90 percent	4	47	28	27	26	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	28	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	27	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	0	4	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	11	12	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/18/2022

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	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

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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	6	6	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	60%	53%	56%				66%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%						65%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						63%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	66%	50%	50%				60%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						57%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						42%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	59%	59%				65%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	63%	52%	11%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	57%	8%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	53%	9%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	20	46	57	45	53	41	29				
ELL	31	53	55	43	65	52	27				
BLK	46	67		29	50						
HSP	46	55	56	57	65	52	44				
MUL	64			73							
WHT	68	65	65	75	67	48	67				
FRL	47	55	52	54	60	44	44				

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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
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	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
---	----

English Language Learners	
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	48
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	55
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	69
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

- Proficiency rates for ELA and Math have increased although ELA proficiency rates tends to be lower than math.
- Increases in both ELA and Math learning gains as well, but math bottom quartile had a significant drop

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

- Math bottom quartile
- ESE students proficiency rates

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

- Lack of intervention time with instructional personnel due to a need for unit gains after the pool and teachers going on leave
- Purposeful planning to address on grade level standards

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Overall math learning gains

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

Focusing on interventions in the classrooms and meaningful small group instruction

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

Continued focus on team planning and analyzing common assessments to determine next steps

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.

- District support tools and instructional guides
- More frequent feedback and reflection from teachers and students

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

-Regular data reviews to include goal setting and monitoring by both teacher and student

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

17% of ESE students were proficient (level 3 or higher) in ELA compared to 60% of the entire school population scoring at or above proficiency in ELA. 40% of ESE students were proficient (level 3 or higher) in math compared to 66% of the entire school population. Focus will be on intentional planning and review of common grade level assessments in order to ensure that students are consistently exposed to on grade level standards during both whole group and small group instruction.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By May of 2023, 25% of ESE students will be proficient in ELA and 45% of ESE students will be proficient in math. All teachers will implement standards based lessons that promote critical thinking using grade level expectations.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Classroom observation data will be used to track trends of implementation of grade level planning sessions. Weekly common assessments will be used for teachers to track trends with students on their grade level. Teachers will track whole class and individual student growth, identify classroom and subgroup trends, and involve students in reflection and goal setting aligned with grade level standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Troy Smith (troy.smith@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers will engage in PLCs and team planning sessions to focus on strategies for ensuring students are mastering on grade level standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Effective planning and implementation will increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Vertical teams will meet every two months to implement/discuss strategies and next steps for school wide initiatives.

Person Responsible

Troy Smith (troy.smith@hcps.net)

Teachers will use district resources and curriculum guides to align with standards and ensure all standards are covered.

Person Responsible

Troy Smith (troy.smith@hcps.net)

Teachers will increase communication to parents through a parent night and other methods in order to support student learning.

Person Responsible

Troy Smith (troy.smith@hcps.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

- Eagle Bucks
- Monthly attendance awards
- Morning show recognition
- Quarterly awards
- Student of the month

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

School counselors - awards, guidance programs, student of the month, positive relationships

Teachers - class rewards, positive praise, incentives, positive relationships, classroom goals

Administration - recognition, positive relationships, proactive discipline