Crystal Lake Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Crystal Lake Middle School

2410 CRYSTAL LAKE DR N, Lakeland, FL 33801

http://www.polk-fl.net/clms

Demographics

Principal: Sarah M IR Anda

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 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: C (45%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: D (39%) 2014-15: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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

Crystal Lake Middle School

2410 CRYSTAL LAKE DR N, Lakeland, FL 33801

http://www.polk-fl.net/clms

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	D

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.

To provide an atmosphere conducive to maximize each student's individual academic potential and positive self-esteem with support from parents, community, and business partners to help ensure a positive and safe culture.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Crystal Lake Middle School seeks to provide an educational program meeting the needs of each unique individual by creating an environment that provides the opportunity for intellectual, aesthetic, physical, social, moral and emotional development. This will be accomplished through a STEM program of interdisciplinary and cooperative learning supported by up-to-date technology and an integrated curriculum focus. We will work together with students, parents, and the community to maintain a safe and positive learning environment. The staff will continue to provide individual students with the support and guidance necessary for success.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cotter, Ronda	Principal	Instructional Leader, Vision and mission, data, math liaison, structures in place
Miller, Talley	Assistant Principal	Scheduling, social studies liaison, volunteer coordinator
Morris, Sheritta	Instructional Coach	Reading coach, Facilitator of Reading and ELA PLCs, parent liaison, new teacher leader
Brown, Mekeisha	Assistant Principal	Discipline, reading and ELA liaison, facilities manager, and PBIS lead

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	334	267	345	0	0	0	0	946
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	43	57	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	17	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	63	49	0	0	0	0	170
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	74	128	0	0	0	0	266

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	61	36	47	0	0	0	0	144

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	55	67	0	0	0	0	207

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
57

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 10/9/2019

Prior Year - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	34	32	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	77	99	0	0	0	0	223
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	34	26	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	47	104	0	0	0	0	218

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	36	44	37	0	0	0	0	117

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	31%	48%	54%	34%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	52%	54%	41%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	48%	47%	33%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	35%	50%	58%	41%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	44%	50%	57%	53%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	48%	51%	40%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	28%	44%	51%	35%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	54%	72%	72%	56%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	334 (0)	267 (0)	345 (0)	946 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	32 (0)	43 (0)	57 (0)	132 (0)
One or more suspensions	10 (0)	10 (0)	17 (0)	37 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	58 (0)	63 (0)	49 (0)	170 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	64 (0)	74 (0)	128 (0)	266 (0)

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	31%	48%	-17%	54%	-23%
	2018	28%	41%	-13%	52%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	27%	42%	-15%	52%	-25%
	2018	25%	42%	-17%	51%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	31%	48%	-17%	56%	-25%
	2018	33%	49%	-16%	58%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	28%	47%	-19%	55%	-27%
	2018	25%	40%	-15%	52%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	28%	39%	-11%	54%	-26%
	2018	25%	40%	-15%	54%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	21%	35%	-14%	46%	-25%
	2018	18%	34%	-16%	45%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	27%	41%	-14%	48%	-21%
	2018	37%	42%	-5%	50%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	54%	70%	-16%	71%	-17%
2018	84%	84%	0%	71%	13%
Compare		-30%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	89%	50%	39%	61%	28%
2018	94%	60%	34%	62%	32%
Compare		-5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	53%	41%	57%	37%
2018	100%	41%	59%	56%	44%
Compare		-6%			

Subgroup Data

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	15	34	28	20	37	34	21	38			
ELL	17	44	49	22	37	39	29	50			
BLK	23	38	44	26	39	44	19	30	80		
HSP	29	43	44	35	47	45	26	57	93		
MUL	33	30		32	33			60			
WHT	38	45	37	39	44	48	36	64	83		
FRL	31	41	39	34	43	47	26	56	86		
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	16	31	28	21	35	33	13	60			
ELL	12	32	30	17	26	26					
ASN	69	54		92	62						
BLK	17	27	27	20	30	31	16	83			
HSP	29	36	35	32	35	32	36	83	90		
MUL	20	32		32	40						

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
WHT	42	50	35	42	45	38	57	83	87		
FRL	27	38	33	31	37	32	34	81	85		

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	10	35	33	16	30	28	9	22			
ELL	13	36	36	25	56	54	11	41			
BLK	23	36	26	30	36	23	23	41	85		
HSP	29	40	28	36	57	53	29	51	76		
MUL	32	44		56	58						
WHT	44	44	45	51	60	37	50	70	80		
FRL	28	36	27	36	48	39	28	48	85		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	38
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	49
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	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	48
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Science showed the lowest performance. Science trend over the past 3 years has been an increase. This is the first year we have seen a decline. Out of the 2 teachers who taught 8th grade science, one teacher did not make as high of proficiency scores as the other teacher. This teacher was a first year teacher.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Civics showed the greatest decline. There was a change in the county of who was to be tested over the past 2 years. More students were tested this year which caused the decline.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap between CLMS and the state was in 6th grade math proficiency. In 6th grade we had a new teacher and a teacher who was Needs Improvement from the prior year.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Math bottom quartile showed the greatest gains. More intensive and strategic supports were given to bottom quartile students by our math interventionist, support facilitator and math coach.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The 2 areas of concern are discipline and classroom attendance. Our suspension rate is high and tardy rates are high which has a direct impact on daily student classroom attendance.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Increase reading proficiency.
2. Increase math proficiency.
3. Increase science proficiency.
4. Increase civics proficiency.
5. Decrease the number of out of school suspension days

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase Reading Proficiency
Rationale	Our subgroups of African American, Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners and Multiracial did not meet the 41% threshold. Also our school-wide proficiency is only at 31%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our proficiency goal will be 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mekeisha Brown (mekeisha.brown@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will continue implementing LSI strategies of target task alignment and adding the success criteria component. School wide we will continue using the reading strategy CUBES to support student comprehension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	LSI is research based district initiative that has shown to increase student achievement.
Action Step	
Description	1. Formal LSI training led by a LSI experts. 2. Utillizing the Reading Coach during PLC time to support teachers in standard/target/task alignment. 3. Targeted interventions for 4 focus sub groups through support facilitators and reading interventions. 4. Utilize short cycle data in PLCs to quickly and effectively intervene. 5. Provide additional supports from District ESOL department. 6. Reading teachers will be formally trained by Achieve 3000 personnel. 7. Morning and afternoon tutoring will be offered for all students. However, certain targeted students will receive invitations to attend.
Person Responsible	Sheritta Morris (sheritta.morris@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Increase Math Proficiency
Rationale	Our subgroups of African American, Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners and Multiracial did not meet the 41% threshold. Also our school-wide proficiency is only at 35%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our math proficiency goal is 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ronda Cotter (ronda.cotter@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will continue implementing LSI strategies of target task alignment and adding the success criteria component. School wide we will continue using the strategy CUBES to support students understanding of word problems.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	LSI is research based district initiative that has shown to increase student achievement.

Action Step	
Description	1. Formal LSI training led by a LSI experts. 2. Utilizing the Math Coach during PLC time to support teachers in standard/target/task alignment. 3. Targeted interventions for 4 focus sub groups through support facilitators and math interventions. 4. Utilize short cycle data in PLCs to quickly and effectively intervene. 5. Morning and afternoon tutoring will be offered to all students. However, targeted students will be invited to to attend tutoring.
Person Responsible	Ronda Cotter (ronda.cotter@polk-fl.net)

#3	
Title	Increase Science Proficiency
Rationale	Our subgroups of African American, Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners and Multiracial did not meet the 41% threshold. Also our school-wide proficiency is only at 28%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Science proficiency goal is 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will continue implementing LSI strategies of target task alignment and adding the success criteria component.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	LSI is research based district initiative that has shown to increase student achievement.
Action Step	
Description	1. Formal LSI training led by a LSI experts. 2. Utilizing an Assistant Principal during PLC time to support teachers in standard/target/task alignment. 3. Targeted interventions for 4 focus sub groups through support facilitators. 4. Utilize short cycle data in PLCs to quickly and effectively intervene.
Person Responsible	Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

#4	
Title	Increase Civics Proficiency
Rationale	Our subgroups of African American, Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners and Multiracial did not meet the 41% threshold. Also our school-wide proficiency is only at 28%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Civics proficiency goal is 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will continue implementing LSI strategies of target task alignment and adding the success criteria component.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	LSI is research based district initiative that has shown to increase student achievement.
Action Step	
Description	1. Formal LSI training led by a LSI experts. 2. Utilizing an Assistant Principal during PLC time to support teachers in standard/target/task alignment. 3. Targeted interventions for 4 focus sub groups through support facilitators. 4. Utilize short cycle data in PLCs to quickly and effectively intervene. 5.
Person Responsible	Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

#5	
Title	Decrease Out of School Suspension Days
Rationale	Students missed a total of 2,546 instructional days due to out of school suspensions. An additional 1,060 days were missed due to in school suspensions. Our focus subgroups are over-represented in discipline data.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to decrease the number of out of school suspension days by 10% to 2,291 days by using proactive management strategies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mekeisha Brown (mekeisha.brown@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	-Implement PBS initiatives school-wide -Building Positive Relationships
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research supports that PBS implementation increases the frequency of positive behavior which subsequently decreases the occurrence of misbehavior. Research also supports that students having a positive relationship with at least one adult increases their likelihood of success.
Action Step	
Description	1. Focus PBS efforts on Tier 1 strategies in an effort to prevent suspend-able behaviors. 2. Provide early and frequent intervention (mentoring) to EWS students. 3. Teachers will participate in a book study reading 'Even On Your Worst Day, You Can Be a Student's Best Hope', by Manny Scott. This will focus on building positive relationships with students. 4. Utilize alternatives to out of school suspension. 5. The Behavioral Interventionist will be responsible for mentoring the students who are continually suspended.
Person Responsible	Mekeisha Brown (mekeisha.brown@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

na

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Crystal Lake hosts monthly parent nights about math, science, reading, social studies, testing strategies and electives. A yearly Open House is held in August to welcome parents back. FCA is supported by Grace City church who supports our students weekly.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

In order to ensure the social and emotional needs of all students we have implemented PBIS and Champs.
Students in need of assistance are referred to Guidance Counselors for assistance. The counselors then in turn make recommendations to outside agencies as necessary.
Students IEPs also identify and address emotional goals for ESE students.
The School Support Team meets weekly to evaluate and discuss the needs of our high risk students.
The Behavioral Interventionist provides strategies students to support their emotional needs.
Mental Health Therapist and Psychologist are on campus weekly to work with students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

We host 2 orientations to welcome the new students. We host a Middle School parent event to welcome all new 6th graders. Guidance counselors go to our feeder schools to introduce them to the programs that are offered. Elective teachers attend a Saturday recruitment fair, WE3 Expo, to share information about the school.
The 8th graders are visited by the guidance counselors of their zoned schools to assist them in completing their schedules. The 8th graders also tour 2 of our feeder high schools.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The Leadership Team meets once a week. During this time data, lesson plans, item specs, up coming tests and critical needs are discussed. Each member is responsible for reporting out about their areas to the team during our weekly meetings.
Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, professional learning opportunities for school staff, as well as parent family engagement opportunities
The ESE department provides strategies and training to assist with our at-risk population. They also assist students with coordinating outside resources to make sure all of our ESE students are successful.
FDLRS provides constant training to teachers to assist them when working with ESE students.
HEARTH program funded by Title IX, provides assistance to our homeless students in the form of transportation and clothing. They will also assist families with finding shelter and assist them with enrolling at schools.
The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic needs. This program supports after-school and Saturday programs, supplemental instructional materials, reading and math interventionists, behavioral interventionist, technology for students, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Students are provided the opportunity to take advanced classes for high school credit such as Algebra, Geometry, Physical Science, and Spanish.
We also partner with local fish farms to breed and raise fish in our aquaculture program. This partnership gives our students real-world experience with supply and demand and helps sustain our programs.
We invite community members to speak to our students every year during our Great American Teach In about their prospective careers.
Career inventories will be used at all grade levels to help students identify skills and interests for college and career planning.
The AVID program gives students the opportunity to become college minded students and to visit local colleges.
Our 8th grade students attended the WE3 Expo to assist with student transitions and interests for high school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Increase Reading Proficiency**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Increase Math Proficiency**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Increase Science Proficiency**	$0.00
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Increase Civics Proficiency**	$0.00
5	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Decrease Out of School Suspension Days**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**