Walter Caldwell Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Walter Caldwell Elementary School

141 DAIRY RD, Auburndale, FL 33823

http://schools.polk-fl.net/caldwell

Demographics

Principal: Kathryn Ashmore

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2021

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (42%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* 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 Polk 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

Walter Caldwell Elementary School

141 DAIRY RD, Auburndale, FL 33823

http://schools.polk-fl.net/caldwell

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 PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

At Caldwell Elementary, we grow leaders and learners every day through highly effective instruction coupled with social and emotional learning that enable students to excel academically.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Caldwell Elementary our students will achieve grade level mastery and be empowered to grow physically, socially and emotionally.

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
Ashmore, Kathryn	Principal	
Hyman, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	
Adams, Aisha	Instructional Coach	
Ostberg, John	Instructional Coach	
Taylor, Nicole	Instructional Technology	
Chisholm, Renne	School Counselor	
Irwin, Tamesia	Instructional Media	
Lamb, Ashlee	Administrative Support	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/10/2021, Kathryn Ashmore

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.*
1

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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
51

Total number of students enrolled at the school
873

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
11

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	144	141	138	153	118	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	846
Attendance below 90 percent	0	71	47	57	29	430	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	634
One or more suspensions	0	10	16	6	7	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA	0	10	8	30	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	7	3	20	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	24	0	0	24	15	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	20	31	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	23	22	25	67	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207

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	23	22	25	67	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	207

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	1	4	10	31	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 7/28/2022

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	0	122	128	127	126	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	616
Attendance below 90 percent	0	35	37	28	40	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	10	6	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	12	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	34	59	62	57	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	251

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	14	24	19	27	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	122	128	127	126	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	616
Attendance below 90 percent	0	35	37	28	40	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	10	6	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	12	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	34	59	62	57	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	251

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	14	24	19	27	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%	47%	56%				44%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						47%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	24%						49%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	37%	42%	50%				47%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	54%						47%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						30%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	49%	59%				29%	47%	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	52%	52%	0%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	34%	48%	-14%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	38%	47%	-9%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

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	58%	56%	2%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	56%	-3%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					
	2019	24%	51%	-27%	60%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	28%	45%	-17%	53%	-25%
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	6	33	35	13	45	50	16				
ELL	26	49	11	21	45	44	20				
BLK	19	32	7	24	48		20				
HSP	36	52	21	29	50	50	26				
MUL	45			40							
WHT	54	56	41	52	63	60	42				
FRL	34	47	20	32	54	52	25				

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	7	15		7	15		7				
ELL	25	28		27	20	18	23				
BLK	18	26		11	11		19				
HSP	28	26		29	18	20	38				
WHT	41	25		31	12		44				
FRL	25	23	24	22	15	24	25				

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	14	19	21	11	20	21	17				
ELL	28	41	39	36	45	44	9				
BLK	39	41	54	46	43	29	30				
HSP	39	48	43	41	47	50	21				
WHT	50	51	62	50	49	13	36				
FRL	41	47	43	42	43	26	23				

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	345
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	25
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	43
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	53
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Math showed greater growth as compared to ELA and Math. ELA bottom 25 was the lowest. Math bottom 25 and Math LG were the highest.

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

ELA bottom 25 learning gains is the greatest area of improvement.

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

SIPPS in all grades to provide phonics interventions.
Fidelity of MTSS processes.

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

Math learning gains and bottom 25.

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

Math iii implementation; Freckle for student practice and data analysis for the teacher.

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

Equitable access to standards - walkthrough tool, learning arcs in 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.

Learning Arc PD to strengthen understanding of BEST Standards.
SIPPS training.
Math Racks and number sense training.

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

Implementation of standards-based walkthrough tool and data analysis protocols.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Data from FSA shows trend of ....
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	State data will show a minimum of +1% proficiency increase for all grades/content as well as 10% of the students just below the proficiency line becoming proficient
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Progress monitoring data offered by district level assessment platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering Benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1. Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework. 2. Monitor students engaging in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using Standards Walkthrough Tool. 3. Develop and engage in school wide data analysis protocol to conduct a correlation between standards walkthrough tool and learning arc planning as well as a data analysis protocol to use with students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	There is a strong correlation between academic success and ensuring students are able to engage in grade level standards-based expectations. It is imperative we both monitor for aligned and plan for teacher's understanding of the Benchmarks and aligned tasks and assessments.

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.

Strategy 1:
Action Step 1: Learning Arc training for administration and leadership team.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1:
Action Step 2: Add discussion of planning results to leadership team meetings on Week B when coaches share results with administration.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1:
Action Step 3: Conduct a correlation between the walkthrough tool data and planning results.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1:
Action Step 4: Coaches conduct planning with teachers weekly.

Person Responsible	Aisha Adams (aisha.adams@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2:
Action Step 1: Training of administration in the Standards-Based Walkthrough tool.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2:
Action Step 2: Create a calendar of calibration walks with coaches.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2:
Action Step 3: First 6 calibration walks will be used as training walks for coaches.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2:
Action Step 4: Continue calibration walks until team is at 90-100% consistency before releasing to individual walks.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Hyman (kimberly.hyman@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2:
Action Step 5: Share walk data with leadership team using school based data protocol on week A of leadership teams.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Hyman (kimberly.hyman@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 3:
Action Step 1: Create a calendar data discussions with the leadership team

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 3:
Action Step 2: Create expectations for data discussions and develop data discussion protocol

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 3:
Action Step 3: Coaches and Admin conduct data protocol with teachers after progress monitoring data is collected.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 3:
Action Step 4: Teachers conduct data chats with students using the protocol in conjunction with student data notebooks.

Person Responsible	Aisha Adams (aisha.adams@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	FSA data shows....ESOL and ESE
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	State data will show a minimum of +1% proficiency increase for ESE and ESOL learning gains
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Progress monitoring data offered by district level assessment platforms will be used to ensure students are progressing on Benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Hyman (kimberly.hyman@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	1. Engage ESE/ESOL teachers/staff in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework. 2. Develop and engage in school wide MTSS processes that maintain fidelity in identifying struggling learners, monitoring effectiveness of tiers and interventions for students including ESOL/ESE students, and monitor the referral process for ESE/ESOL services if required. 3. Develop and engage in school wide data analysis protocol to conduct a correlation between standards walkthrough tool and learning arc planning as well as a data analysis protocol to use with students specifically focused on ESE and ESOL students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria**	There is a strong correlation between academic success and ensuring all students, including ESE and ESOL students, are able to engage in grade level standards-based expectations. It is imperative we both monitor for aligned and plan for ESE/ESOL teacher's understanding of the Benchmarks and aligned tasks and assessments. In addition, it is crucial that we streamline and monitor progress of the invention programs and processes we have on campus so students do not fall through the cracks.

used for selecting this strategy.

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.

Strategy 1:
Action Step 1: Learning Arc training for administration and leadership team.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1:
Action Step 2: Add discussion of planning results to leadership team meetings on Week B when coaches share results with administration.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1:
Action Step 3: Conduct a correlation between the walkthrough tool data and planning results.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 1:
Action Step 4: Coaches conduct planning with teachers weekly.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2:
Action Step 1: Admin and LEA will develop a MTSS process flow chart, guidebook, etc. for teachers to utilize to make understanding of tiers and intervention clear.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Hyman (kimberly.hyman@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2:
Action Step 2: Admin and LEA will train teachers on Caldwell's MTSS processes/procedures.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Hyman (kimberly.hyman@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2:
Action Step 3: Admin, LEA, and coaches will meet monthly with teachers for MTSS data chats utilizing the school wide data analysis protocol while focusing on ESE, ESOL, and tier students. This chat will include discussing the fidelity and effective of interventions being used. Intervention programs include, but are not limited to, SIPPS, LLI, Math Racks/Building Math Minds.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Hyman (kimberly.hyman@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 2:
Action Step 4: LEA and Admin will keep a list of students in tiers or receiving services to monitor their progress and/or their progress in the referral process.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Hyman (kimberly.hyman@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 3:
Action Step 1: Create a calendar data discussions with the leadership team

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 3:
Action Step 2: Create expectations for data discussions and develop data discussion protocol

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 3:
Action Step 3: Coaches and Admin conduct data protocol with teachers after progress monitoring data is collected.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

Strategy 3:
Action Step 4: Teachers conduct data chats with students using the protocol in conjunction with student data notebooks.

Person Responsible	Kathryn Ashmore (kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

50% of students in kindergarten through grade 2, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, were not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

61% of students in grades 3-5 were not on track to score a Level 3 or higher on the statewide, standardized ELA Assessment.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

As a results of ELA tiered interventions 70% of students will demonstrate proficiency, Level 3 or Higher or 75th percentile or higher on STAR Early Lit/Reading Assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

As a result of ELA tiered interventions 50% of students will demonstrate proficiency, Level 3 or higher, on the FAST Assessment

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Progress monitoring data from STAR and district assessments will be analyzed frequently by the leadership and faculty to make instructional decisions as the year progresses. In addition to data analysis, the leadership team will coordinate frequent classroom walks to monitor the fidelity of instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Ashmore, Kathryn, kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Tier 2 and tier 3 interventions will be provided during small group instruction and Power Hour. Substantially deficient students will receive small group instruction with targeted interventions in core content areas. We will be utilizing Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Interventions, SIPPS and From Phonics to Reading

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The intervention programs selected provides daily, intensive small group instruction that supports foundational skills.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Use formative assessments to differentiate instruction for extension and remediation. After each module/unit assessment, provide reaching and re-evaluate utilizing a formative assessment. Use I-station, STAR, and Smarty Ants to progress monitor and differentiate instruction for all grade-levels	Adams, Aisha, aisha.adams@polk-fl.net
Schedule monthly data check-ins with teacher and students. During this time review goals, progress towards goals and potential barriers. The data chats will include but are not limited to: STAR, FAST, AR, IStation, Smarty Ants, Florida Wonders assessments, formatives, attendance, behavior and any additional data that will contribute to student success	Hyman, Kimberly, kimberly.hyman@polk-fl.net
Both Reading Interventionists (K-2) and (3-5) will work with teachers and students to diagnose reading deficits and provide specific interventions. Utilizing the SIPPS invention program and Leveled Literacy Interventions (LLI) (Fountas and Pinnell) reading intervention program. Additional LLI kits will be purchased to meet student learning needs.	Ashmore, Kathryn, kathryn.ashmore@polk-fl.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.

Caldwell has established a house system that cultivates a sense of belonging. The house system promotes school spirit and teamwork. It is our desire to nourish and sustain a school culture that extends through our students and staff to our families and the community we serve to develop within our school a sense of belonging, responsibility, respect, and pride. Our houses create for students' opportunities for leadership, mentoring, service projects, and competition through academics and various activities. The Ladies of Caldwell is a leadership club for girls that Embodies integrity, service, kindness, and respect. We will incorporate portions of "The Leader in Me" curriculum to provide a framework for the content used for House assemblies.

Caldwell has a practice of using surveys to get input from our students about student-related issues and incentives; input from staff concerning professional development, opportunities, and more. We also use surveys to get input from our families and community. Caldwell is very active within our community through our Facebook page to not only deliver important news and school information but also highlighting the positive stories of success, the innovative teaching and learning happening across campus. We want to tell stories of accomplishment and collaboration whenever there's an opportunity. This public relations platform allows us to interact with our families and community through posts, comments, and direct messages to ensure all stakeholders have an active voice and we communicate our vision that we grow leaders and learners every day. Every year, Caldwell participates in the Back to School Bash community project sponsored by the City of Auburndale. Our school also creates service projects to give back to the Auburndale community. Previous projects include donating money to the Auburndale Police K-9 Unit, a canned food drive to donate to the local food pantry and writing letters to veterans to show gratitude for their service. The principal is also an active member of the Auburndale Rotary Club. Select community members, parents, and teachers all serve as members of our School Advisory Council (SAC Committee).

Cubby's Closet was developed to help our students and families in need. It is a small room on campus where we keep clothes, jackets, hygiene items, shoes, backpacks with school supplies, and other student needed items. This allows us to meet the needs of families and students that come to us for aid. We have an active PTA and volunteers at our school that is welcome and encouraged to serve our students in areas of need. Our volunteers help with many events, tutoring/mentoring needs, service projects, and help to create a positive impact on student learning.

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

The Principal of the school is an active member of the Rotary club. The Rotary club provided classroom supplies and goodies to teachers every year. Various members of the Rotary club serve on the SAC committee. The entire leadership team is responsible for promoting positive school culture. Each member is

assigned a new teacher to serve as their mentor/ or personal "go-to" person. They are responsible for helping the new teacher/staff member become acclimated to the school.