

Broward County Public Schools

Cresthaven Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Cresthaven Elementary School

801 NE 25TH ST, Pompano Beach, FL 33064

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Donald Lee

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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
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 Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (38%) 2014-15: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Cresthaven Elementary School

801 NE 25TH ST, Pompano Beach, FL 33064

[no web address on file]

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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	93%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	92%

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 Broward 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.

The mission of Cresthaven Elementary is to provide research based differentiated instruction aligned to state standards to address the needs of all learners in a safe, educational environment supported by technology, real-life applications and targeted professional development for staff.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cresthaven Elementary's vision is to prepare our students for college and career in a competitive 21st century global economy by providing the foundation that includes rigorous content and application of knowledge through high-order skills.

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
Lee, Donald	Principal	As principal, Mr. Lee, provides the strategic direction the leadership team takes to support school achievement.
Heavner, Jan	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Heavner supports the vision and direction of the principal to foster and safe and effective learning environment.
Addeo, Jamie	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Addeo provides teachers with effective teaching strategies and gives support and feedback to improve instructional practice.
Johnson, Anquanita	Teacher, ESE	As an ESE teacher, Ms. Johnson provides support to the school to ensure that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance.
Dektor, Brian	School Counselor	As the Guidance Counselor, Mr. Dektor helps guide students' academic, behavioral and social growth.

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	66	71	97	75	89	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	484
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	

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	2	21	19	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

37

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

Prior Year - As Reported
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

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	22	20	16	16	10	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	4	2	4	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	38	33	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	10	2	3	14	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	44%	59%	57%	38%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	60%	58%	55%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	54%	53%	44%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	65%	63%	45%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	66%	62%	55%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	53%	51%	43%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	46%	53%	31%	45%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	66 (0)	71 (0)	97 (0)	75 (0)	89 (0)	86 (0)	484 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 ()	0 ()	3 ()	2 ()	2 ()	0 ()	8 (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)

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
03	2019	31%	60%	-29%	58%	-27%
	2018	46%	59%	-13%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	62%	-16%	58%	-12%
	2018	40%	58%	-18%	56%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	35%	59%	-24%	56%	-21%
	2018	35%	56%	-21%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	65%	-13%	62%	-10%
	2018	39%	63%	-24%	62%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	67%	-19%	64%	-16%
	2018	43%	63%	-20%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	44%	64%	-20%	60%	-16%
	2018	38%	62%	-24%	61%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	36%	49%	-13%	53%	-17%
	2018	31%	51%	-20%	55%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	18	38	31	21	40	38	17				

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
ELL	40	55	48	48	57	39	33				
BLK	37	46	44	55	68	58	32				
HSP	42	50	53	46	55	44	33				
WHT	82	69		82	85						
FRL	44	52	50	53	63	50	35				
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	10	46	47	16	35	29	10				
ELL	38	62	65	40	38	29					
BLK	46	56	39	37	32	12	33				
HSP	40	55	75	48	40	33	37				
WHT	58	60		46	73						
FRL	43	52	56	43	43	32	32				
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	14	47	42	19	58	42	6				
ELL	26	54	48	38	60	55	16				
BLK	31	55	44	39	44	39	19				
HSP	43	58	48	51	66	39	42				
WHT	35	47		35	58		27				
FRL	35	54	44	42	54	42	30				

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	80
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	50
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.

The students with disabilities subgroup showed the lowest performance in ELA, math, and science. Though those students did improve performance compared to the 2018 FSA, it is still concerning because SWD subgroup scores were far below those of other subgroups in 2018 and 2019. Contributing factors for low performance include lack of fidelity in reading interventions offered as tiered support and inexperience of a few new teachers who were instructing 3rd graders.

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

Grade 3 ELA proficiency had the largest decline with a 2019 drop of 15 points as compared to 2018. Students were not prepared coming from 2nd grade as indicated by Benchmark Assessment System (BAS). The pullout resource teacher conducting interventions was not able to meet with groups with fidelity.

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.

Grade 3 ELA at 31% had the largest gap as compared to the state average of 58% (-27% difference). Two new teachers with limited expertise in instructional delivery contributed to the decline in reading proficiency scores.

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

The learning gains for all subgroups in math showed the most improvement. Black students in the lowest 25% made the greatest gains, 58%, compared to last year as 12%. Cresthaven utilized a math resource/coach to provide support to teachers. Teachers used Acaletics math program with fidelity and a resource teacher conducted small groups with struggling students.

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

Attendance is an area of concern. Last year 19% of students had attendance below 90%.

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

1. Increase ELA reading proficiency-specifically grade 3
2. Increase proficiency and learning gains for students with disabilities in ELA and Math.
3. Focus on rigor in the primary grades to align with Florida Standards

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Increase proficiency in ELA of 3rd grade students.

Rationale There was a 15 point drop in ELA proficiency for grade 3 from 2018 to 2019.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

By June 2020, 3rd grade students will increase ELA proficiency by 5 points from 31% to at least 36% as measured by the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Donald Lee (donald.lee@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy

Support staff and teachers will fill in the foundation gaps in reading through early identification of students below level on the Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) and then providing research based interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Many students in grade 3 require additional supports in reading as evidenced by assessments measuring mastery of reading standards. The state and district implemented a substantial reading deficiency process for early identification of students K-3 so that interventions could be started to narrow the achievement gap. We have determined that several students require this level of support and will be given tier 3 strategies.

Action Step

1. Based on Multi-tiered Systems of Support, the Collaborative Problem Solving Team (CPST) will identify and determine the level of support/intervention.
2. 3rd grade students will be provided an intervention such as LLI or the Journeys Reading Tool Kit.
3. Support staff, CPST, and administration will monitor student progress with the Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) to determine response to the intervention at the Tier 2 level.
4. Students needing more support, will be enrolled in the Functional Basic Skills in Reading Course at the Tier 3 level of support.

Description

Person Responsible

Donald Lee (donald.lee@browardschools.com)

#2

Title Increase proficiency and learning gains for students with disabilities in ELA and math.

Rationale Though students with disabilities (SWD) increased proficiency in both ELA and math in 2019, proficiency in both areas had 2 consecutive years of proficiency below 32%. Learning gains in math increased, but gains in ELA dropped considerably. Lowest quartile SWDs dropped 16 points from the previous year.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

By June 2020, students with disabilities will increase proficiency and learning gains in math and ELA by at least 5 points as measured by the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Donald Lee (donald.lee@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy

Students with disabilities will be given differentiated instruction in both ELA and math. The classroom teacher will provide hands-on explicit instruction to the student within a small group. Student progress will be monitored with formative assessments. A research based math program, Acaletics, will be used to provide a spiraling curriculum of standards. Guided reading at each student's instructional BAS level will be conducted daily.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Students with disabilities (SWD) will be provided differentiated instruction targeted to their specific needs. Extra remediation will be given students with disabilities in small groups to increase scores of students in the lowest quartile. Often SWDs have IEP goals that teachers and the resource ESE facilitator develop through small group, but we will also need to build in time to monitor and explicitly remediate skills that have not been mastered. Frequent exposure to math standards through Acaletics will ensure that students often revisit required skills.

Action Step

Description

1. Teachers will meet with support coaches to to improve practice in Acaletics and Guided reading. On-going professional development will be provided as needed.
2. Teachers will provide rigorous instruction aligned to the ELA and Math standards, while also meeting individual needs through explicit small group lessons.
3. Teachers will implement Athletics and guided reading instruction with fidelity.
4. Administration and support staff will meet with teachers in quarterly data chats to discuss student progress.
5. Student progress will frequently be monitored through the use of BAS, Standards based assessments, and Acaletics scrimmages.

Person Responsible

Donald Lee (donald.lee@browardschools.com)

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).

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.

Cresthaven Elementary builds relationships with parents and community by holding events that target student achievement, through utilization of engaging activities to assist parents with strategies for helping their children at home. Some of those events include Multi-cultural Night, Reading and Math nights, and academic evenings specific to ESOL students. Parents are encouraged to participate in the School Advisory Council (SAC), School Advisory Forum, and PTA. The SAC is essential to developing and monitoring the school improvement plan. Business partnerships are maintained to strengthen community ties.

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.

Cresthaven Elementary develops the "whole child" in both cognitive and emotional domains. To ensure the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, the Guidance Counselor conducts small group discussion among students with specific needs. Needs are determined by referral from the teacher, parent, or the Collaborative Problem Solving Team. Community mentors are paired with students needing guided support in making good choices.

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

Cresthaven has 4 ESE Pre-K classess and two Head Start classes to ensure a smooth transition to Kindergarten. Prior to the start of the Kindergarten year, a screening is offered to students to determine academic levels for effective grouping and matriculation into Kindergarten. Parents sign up for the screening at the K Round-up or when they register their child during the summer. Outgoing cohorts transition to Middle School through orientation programs conducted at Cresthaven by various middle schools. Invitations to informational meetings concerning magnet programs are given to students and their parents.

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.

Title I funds are used to supplement Tier 1 instruction in classrooms. Reading programs, such as Ready Reading, are used for all grade levels to ensure that questioning about text meets the rigor of the Florida Standards. All students including ESOL and SWDs benefit from exposure and remediation in math through a supplemental program, Acaletics. 2018-19 was the first year the Acaletics program was used and all subgroups showed improvement as measured by the FSA and benchmark assessments. Mr. Lee, principal, and the leadership team monitor progress in those assessments. Title I funds are also

used for staff development, such as training in Thinking Maps, materials such as classroom library books, and parent involvement activities. Reading Nights and Family Math Nights provide strategies for parents to use to help their children at home. In the upcoming school year, there are 4 family events planned with a focus on reading, science, and math for ESOL students and families provided to us by the ESOL department. Our Head Start program provides a good foundation for students and many of those families secure reassignments to attend Cresthaven Kindergarten through 5th. Funds from the SMART Bond greatly enhanced technology at the school.

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

Each year, the students at Cresthaven Elementary participate in Career Day. Community stakeholders present career options to students by providing them with details of various jobs. Students are given a close look at careers and how they can start preparing in elementary school. Many students became interested in computer coding after a few presenters discussed their jobs as game developers. One community partner is JA Biztown/Junior Achievement. Every year 5th graders visit and participate in many different jobs with salaries to understand the connection of school decisions to future careers.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase proficiency in ELA of 3rd grade students.				\$23,698.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	510-Supplies	0901 - Cresthaven Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$6,280.00
<i>Notes: Ready MAFS for student assessments to monitor progress.</i>						
	5100		0901 - Cresthaven Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,918.00
<i>Notes: Writescore For grades 4-5 to monitor ELA progress.</i>						
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0901 - Cresthaven Elementary School	General Fund		\$13,500.00
<i>Notes: Saturday FSA Camp for grades 3-5</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase proficiency and learning gains for students with disabilities in ELA and math.				\$12,969.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	510-Supplies	0901 - Cresthaven Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$9,445.00
<i>Notes: Math spiraling curriculum</i>						
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	0901 - Cresthaven Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,300.00
<i>Notes: Substitute teachers for classrooms when teachers attend district and school professional development in math.</i>						
	6400	200-Employee Benefits	0901 - Cresthaven Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$124.00

			<i>Notes: Substitute teachers-Fringe expense</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0901 - Cresthaven Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,100.00
			<i>Notes: Acaletics math curriculum aligned to MAFS</i>			
Total:						\$36,667.00