

Polk County Public Schools

Crystal Lake Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

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: 4/15/2015

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 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	68%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	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.

To provide an atmosphere conducive to maximizing 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.

To foster a safe and supportive learning environment where students have opportunities to engage in rigorous instruction. Prepare students for the real-world by offering instruction that is challenging, collaborative and creative in order to encourage student ownership of their learning. We strive to meet our students' social and emotional needs to support our students in achieving academic success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 4/15/2015, Sarah M IR Anda

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

1

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

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	340	274	352	0	0	0	0	966	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	36	61	0	0	0	0	133	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	69	91	0	0	0	0	275	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	11	0	0	0	0	44	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	25	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	86	169	0	0	0	0	344	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	108	61	0	0	0	0	268	
STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	100	123	0	0	0	0	345	
STAR Math Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	80	136	0	0	0	0	344	

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	229	184	249	0	0	0	0	662	

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	4	7	8	0	0	0	0	19	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/10/2020

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		
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	

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		
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	

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	
	(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.

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			

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	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						
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%	2
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%	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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	48
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 shown an increase in proficiency. 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.

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 in proficiency. This was impacted by the change in the social studies progression implemented by the District. There was a greater number of students tested in the 18-19 school year than the prior school year.

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. There was a high percentage of the incoming 6th graders who were performing below grade level. Although students made gains, they did not obtain the anticipated proficiency level.

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?

The two areas of concern are discipline and classroom attendance. Our suspension and tardy rates are high which has a direct impact on daily student classroom attendance. When students are out of class due to tardiness or behavior this can negatively impact the amount of instructional time they receive.

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instruction will be delivered in a rigorous manner that allows for students to engage in a productive struggle to ensure that the full intent of the standard is met. In the past we have struggled to achieve the appropriate level of rigor to fully met the intent of the standard. In 2018-2019 more than 65% of our students were performing below grade level in reading and math. Four out of seven ESSA subgroups that we qualify for including, African Americans, Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners and Multi-racial, did not meet the 41% threshold.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of rigorous standard based instruction: 36% of our students will achieve proficiency on the state reading assessment, 40% of our students will achieve proficiency on the state math assessment, 35% of students will achieve proficiency in Science. Both reading and math would be a 5% increase from our current level of proficiency and science would be a 7% increase in proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ronda Cotter (ronda.cotter@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will continue to implement the Marzano researched based strategies of target/task alignment along with success criteria to ensure that our students are receiving aligned standard based instruction. In order to achieve the level of rigor and productive struggle necessary from our students we will add the researched based teaming strategy from LSI. AVID WICOR strategies will also be implemented school wide to strengthen our students reading comprehension and writing skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The reason behind utilizing these specific strategies is LSI has been implemented in our school for the past three years. During the 18-19 school year, outside of science and civics, we saw gains or our data remained steady in every area. We have built a large resource base of LSI tools to help support our teachers with the implementation of LSI strategies. Along with the factors mentioned above, our teachers comfort level plays an important role in the continuation of these strategies as it is what has become the norm for them over the past three years.

Action Steps to Implement

Continue to implement focus walks using LSI trend tracker.

Person Responsible Ronda Cotter (ronda.cotter@polk-fl.net)

Utilize the Math and Reading Coaches during PLC time to support teacher's need

Person Responsible Sheritta Morris (sheritta.morris@polk-fl.net)

Use of the Math and Reading interventionist for targeted interventions for the 4 ESSA focus sub groups.

Person Responsible Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

Morning and afternoon tutoring will be offered to all students. Our targeted students will be highly encouraged to attend.

Person Responsible Mekeisha Brown (mekeisha.brown@polk-fl.net)

Reading teachers will be formally trained by Achieve 3000 personnel to ensure they are using the program with fidelity. This will enable our students to get the most out of the program.

Person Responsible Talley Miller (talley.miller@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will be trained in AVID strategies that will be utilized in all classrooms.

Person Responsible Sheritta Morris (sheritta.morris@polk-fl.net)

ELL paraprofessional will be used in all content areas to support the ELL ESSA group of students. The Success Coach will support our SWD ESSA group of students via Language Arts and Math classes.

Person Responsible Ronda Cotter (ronda.cotter@polk-fl.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: One way to maintain a positive school climate is to reduce the number of disruptions on campus through the implementation of PBIS. Disruptive behaviors can often create an atmosphere that makes learning difficult to occur. By working to reduce the number of referrals for disruptions, we expect to obtain higher academic achievement for all students.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2019-2020 school year, 258 referrals were submitted for disruptive behaviors which put us on pace to reduce disruptions prior to the transition to distance learning. In 2018-2019, 352 referrals were submitted for disruptions. Our goal is to reduce the number of disruptive incidents by 10% to 317 in relation to the 2018-2019 data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mekeisha Brown (mekeisha.brown@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: In order to achieve our goal of decreasing disruptive behavior referrals, we will continue to implement Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS). Research has shown that when implemented with fidelity, the occurrence of positive behaviors increase which would subsequently decrease negative behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Over the last few years, the PBIS committee has worked to steadily improve our PBIS program. We have already seen improvements in our data. In 2018-2019, we had 285 referrals through March 15, 2019. At the same point this year, that number was reduced to 258. We are working toward full PBIS implementation and expect to see those numbers continue to decline.

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize the Behavior Interventionist and Success coach to work with the Tier 3 students.

Person Responsible Mekeisha Brown (mekeisha.brown@polk-fl.net)

Incorporate PBIS strategies in staff development meetings.

Person Responsible Mekeisha Brown (mekeisha.brown@polk-fl.net)

Continue to improve and schedule PBIS events.

Person Responsible Mekeisha Brown (mekeisha.brown@polk-fl.net)

Continue to utilize RTIB as an intervention with students.

Person Responsible Mekeisha Brown (mekeisha.brown@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The leadership team will meet weekly to discuss instruction and academic data. During these meetings, we will focus on the progression of classroom instruction and assess whether the data is reflective of the progress we would like see. Coaches share teacher feedback and concerns in order to create a plan that is reasonable for everyone to implement. The team utilizes data, observations and feedback from the staff to determine the professional development needs of the school.

We also discuss discipline data in leadership meetings. We analyze the data and look for positive and negative trends. From there, we determine whether we need to adjust policies to reduce any negative behaviors that continue to occur.

The leadership team also maintains high visibility throughout the campus. This helps to ensure positive interactions with students and teachers, as well as decrease the likelihood of any negative or disruptive behaviors.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

In order to keep building a positive school culture and environment we will continue to implement PBIS not only for our students but staff as well. PBIS committee meets monthly to assess school needs and develop a calendar of events for activities. These are planned in hopes to encourage students to make the right choices and to help increase staff morale on campus.

We invite parents, community members, etc. to our monthly PTO/SAC meetings. During the meetings we solicit feedback from the parents and community members about the school performance. Also during these meetings, funding is approved to alleviate the cost of materials and resources to make sure all students have equal access to a high quality education.

We host monthly family nights based off of content area to provide our parents with insight into their children's education. During those family nights we seek feedback on how we can continuously improve and better support our students and parents. We also provide information and resources so that parents can continue support academics at home.

We have an established FCA Program through our relationship with Grace City Church and Southeastern University. The positive impact that our students have felt through this program and the relationship with these community partners continue to grow each year. The FCA program has stemmed into a mentorship with many of the Southeastern University students. They have helped many of our students not only navigate the academic side of middle school but also help meet their social emotional needs.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$245,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1501 - Crystal Lake Middle School	Title, I Part A	950.0	\$245,000.00
			<i>Notes: Title 1 funds will be used to pay for the salaries a reading coach, a math coach, 2 math interventionists and a reading interventionist.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline				\$105,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1501 - Crystal Lake Middle School	Title, I Part A	950.0	\$105,000.00
			<i>Notes: Title I funds will be used to pay the salaries of a behavior interventionist and a success coach.</i>			
Total:						\$350,000.00