

Polk County Public Schools

Crystal Lake Middle School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

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: 4/27/2015

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Crystal Lake Middle School

2410 CRYSTAL LAKE DR N, Lakeland, FL 33801

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">69%</p>

School Grades History

	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Year				
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 4/27/2015, 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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

960

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

12

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

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	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	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	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	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/23/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	8	0	0	0	0	19

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				31%	48%	54%	31%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				43%	52%	54%	39%	47%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	48%	47%	33%	42%	47%
Math Achievement				35%	50%	58%	34%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains				44%	50%	57%	38%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	48%	51%	34%	51%	51%
Science Achievement				28%	44%	51%	39%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				54%	72%	72%	82%	86%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	31%	48%	-17%	54%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	27%	42%	-15%	52%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
08	2021					
	2019	31%	48%	-17%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	28%	47%	-19%	55%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	28%	39%	-11%	54%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
08	2021					
	2019	21%	35%	-14%	46%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	27%	41%	-14%	48%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	54%	70%	-16%	71%	-17%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	89%	50%	39%	61%	28%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	94%	53%	41%	57%	37%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

6th grade - STAR

7th grade - Reading and Math - STAR, Civics - District Quarterly Testing

8th grade - Reading and Math - STAR, Science- District Quareterly Testing

		Grade 6			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		33	31	32
	Economically Disadvantaged		28	27	28
	Students With Disabilities		9	12	8
	English Language Learners		22	13	6
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		34	30	27
	Economically Disadvantaged		32	26	25
	Students With Disabilities		14	8	3
	English Language Learners		8	16	15

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	35	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	32	28
	Students With Disabilities	10	8	7
	English Language Learners	18	16	15
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35	37	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	35	31
	Students With Disabilities	21	18	17
	English Language Learners	24	24	18
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	52	44	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	42	51
	Students With Disabilities	14	14	18
	English Language Learners	55	48	57

Grade 8					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		42	44	35
	Economically Disadvantaged		40	39	34
	Students With Disabilities		8	18	9
	English Language Learners		13	19	11
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		34	49	46
	Economically Disadvantaged		34	45	43
	Students With Disabilities		8	16	15
	English Language Learners		25	33	30
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		57	36	39
	Economically Disadvantaged		54	33	34
	Students With Disabilities		23	10	10
	English Language Learners		61	39	41
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	7	15	9	7	18	17	6	31			
ELL	16	28	33	20	29	29	16	45			
BLK	16	25	18	22	33	31	28	49	75		
HSP	24	31	30	19	27	29	22	46	58		
MUL	39	43		26	33						
WHT	39	38	24	41	34	29	44	73	69		
FRL	24	30	23	26	31	30	29	55	60		
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		

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
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	33
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	362
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	94%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
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	28
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	33
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	32
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	35
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	43
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	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

In our 6th grade, we had a steady decline in proficiency for reading and math between Fall to Winter STAR assessment for most subgroups. Only students with disabilities made an increase in reading proficiency.

In our 7th grade overall, our proficiency went up in reading and math between the fall and winter STAR assessment. SWD and ELL students both decreased by 2 percentage points in reading. SWD students decreased 3 percentage points and ELL students remained the same in math.

In our 8th grade, overall, our proficiency in reading and math had an increase between the fall and winter STAR assessment. All subgroups went up except for Economically disadvantage students which decreased only 1 percentage point. 8th grade math proficiency had a 15% increase.

Civics overall went down from Fall to Winter but increased Winter to Spring. All the subgroups went down also except for SWD students who maintained their proficiency.

Science overall went down from Fall to Spring in all subgroups.

Civics overall went down from Fall to Winter but increased Winter to Spring. All the subgroups went down also except for SWD students who maintained their proficiency.

Science overall went down from Fall to Spring in all subgroups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement is an increase in our reading and science proficiency. Reading proficiency sits at 31% overall from 18-19. Our science proficiency went from 39% in 17-18 to 28% proficient in 18-19. Our science progress monitoring data also had an 18% decline from fall to spring.

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

One contributing factor to our low proficiency is that we did not have a dedicated ESOL teacher. For the 21-22 school year we will have a dedicated ESOL teacher. Also, for the 21-22 school year 5 out of 6 reading teachers will be reading endorsed. This year, reading classes will begin to incorporate foundational skills through the BEST standards. This will hopefully address any barriers that students have with reading comprehension.

To address science deficiencies, science teachers will heavily utilize progress monitoring data. This

data will help teachers know which standards the students demonstrate mastery or where they need remediation. Science teachers will utilize bellwork to reteach the 6th and 7th grade standards.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math overall showed the most improvement in proficiency, learning gains and bottom quartile.

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

Full time 6th and 7th grade intensive math teachers were in place for the 20-21 school year. The core math teachers are veteran teachers with proven success. The math teachers along with the math coach and math interventionists created progress monitoring assessments that were used to remediate in small group or through individual direct instruction.

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

MTSS data will be utilized to determine which students have the highest needs. From there, teachers and interventionists will use targeted interventions to remediate the skills and standards in which students may still need support.

We will also incorporate student teaming strategies in order to encourage student autonomy and empower students to take ownership of their learning.

Before and after school tutoring will be offered to students.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

There will be several professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders. The principal will provide training on how to disseminate student data to identify focus students and provide the necessary targeted interventions for these students. We will also conduct a book study utilizing the text Student Teaming: You Got This. We will do an in-depth study each week in our leadership meeting to discuss how we can provide teachers with the necessary PD through PLC to ensure that teaming is being implemented with fidelity in the classroom setting.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond include having a dedicated ESOL unit on campus to provide necessary services for those students. We will also have a before and after school tutor program. Our student success coach, behavior interventionist, along with our math and reading interventionists will provide target support for students that are in tiers 2 and 3 of MTSS.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group 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 2020-2021 based off of our Winter Star Reading data: 69% of 6th grade , 65% of 7th grade and 56% of 8th grade students were performing below grade level. In 2020-2021 based off of our Winter Star Math data: 70% of 6th grade , 63% of 7th grade and 51% of 8th grade students were performing below grade level. 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.

Monitoring: The Area of Focus will be monitored through lesson plans, focus walks, and PLC minutes. Administrators will be assigned to each core content area to oversee the implementation. Administrators and coaches will report out their observations and data weekly at the Leadership Team Meeting.

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. We will be conducting a book study throughout the school year utilizing You Got This! A Teacher's Survival Guide to further support the implementation of academic student teaming.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The reason behind utilizing these specific strategies is LSI has been implemented in our school for the past four years. 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 four years.

Action Steps to Implement

Using our book study book, You Got This! as a guide, ongoing professional development will be provided to teachers to support them with the successful implementation of academic teaming strategies.

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

Utilize the Math and Reading Coaches during PLC time to support the teacher's with planning rigorous instruction while beginning to implement teaming into their lessons.

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

Math and reading interventionists will be used for targeted interventions for the 4 ESSA focus sub groups.

Person Responsible Sheritta Morris (sheritta.morris@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 2020-2021 school year, 138 referrals were submitted for disruptive behaviors. In order to make provisions for the increase in number of students returning to campus this school year, the goal is to keep the number of disruptions at or below 200.

Monitoring: Discipline data is pulled weekly and shared with the school-based leadership team. Early Warning System data is also pulled to determine which students have tier 2 or 3 needs.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS), when implemented with fidelity, has shown to increase the occurrence of positive behaviors and decrease the occurrence of negative behaviors. This year, we will begin to implement restorative practices when possible as an alternative to disciplinary actions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Over the years, we have worked to increase PBIS strategies school-wide. This has reflected in our year-to-year data which shows slight decreases in discipline data. We will continue to work to achieve our goal of full PBIS implementation. Much research shows that restorative practices improve school climate and decrease the number of office discipline referrals when administered correctly. Restorative practices are also shown to close racial disparity gaps that exist within discipline data.

Action Steps to Implement

The Behavioral interventionist and Success Coach will work with the Tier 3 students. The Behavior Interventionist and Success Coach will also work with students to utilize restoratives practices.

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

PBIS strategies will be incorporated at all staff development meetings.

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

Student input will be solicited for improving PBIS events and rewards. We will continue to improve PBIS throughout the school year.

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

RTIB will be utilized as an intervention with students.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

After viewing and analyzing the safeschoolsforalex.org dashboard, Crystal Lake ranked top 10 in the state of number of suspensions per 100 students for the 2019-2020 school year. In order to improve our suspension rate, we will begin to utilize restorative practices as an alternative to suspension when it is possible. Teachers will be provided professional development on using restorative practices as a part of their classroom management plan. The Behavior Interventionist, Dean, and Assistant Principals who handle discipline will work with teachers throughout the year to support those who may struggle with successful implementation of restorative practices. The Behavior Interventionist and Success Coach will work with our tier 2/3 students to support them with behavior management strategies. Discipline data will continue to be pulled and shared with the leadership team on a weekly basis. Suspension data is one of the areas that is monitored on the weekly discipline data sheet.

Another area of concern is how high we ranked in drug/public order incidents (#455/553). Vaping and e-cigarette usage is an emerging trend among young adults. This is reflected in our data as well. We will continue to work with our School Resource Deputy to deal with these incidents as they arise, but also work on ways we can prevent tobacco, vaping, and drug use/possession on campus. We will also continue to work with school counselors and mental health staff to support students who may be using tobacco or drugs to cope with stress and/or trauma. Resources will continue to be provided to parents who wish to seek support for their student.

The school-based leadership team meets weekly to discuss data as well as any needs or concerns that teachers have shared in weekly PLCs. The information shared in these meetings is how we monitor the culture and environment of our school and determine which areas need to be improved. Hopefully as suspension numbers decrease, this will be reflected through a more positive school culture and environment.

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.

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.

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

School administrators will monitor systems in place that work to promote a positive school culture and environments. Administrators will also provide supports to other stakeholders as needed.

School staff will implement systems in place to promote a positive school culture. If these systems are implemented correctly, teachers should notice a more positive climate in the classroom.

Parents are invited to support initiatives at home. During parent nights, parents are given surveys and invited to share and feedback or concerns they have. Parents are also invited to join PTO so they can have input on the school culture and environment.

Community stakeholders are invited to join our SAC committee to support the school. We have also worked to form partnerships with community members that provide goods/services to our students through PBIS.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				\$351,266.97
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	100-Salaries	1501 - Crystal Lake Middle School	Title, I Part A	966.0	\$351,266.97
			<i>Notes: Math coach, reading coach, reading interventionist and 2 math interventionist will be used to support this area of focus.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline				\$145,343.31
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	100-Salaries	1501 - Crystal Lake Middle School	Title, I Part A	966.0	\$145,343.31

	<i>Notes: Behavioral Interventionist and Success Coach will be used to support the culture and environment of the school.</i>
	Total: \$496,610.28