2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Crystal Lake Elementary School

700 GALVIN DR
Lakeland, FL 33801
863-499-2966
http:// schools.polk-fl.net/crystallakeelementary

School Demographics

School Type	Title I	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
Elementary School	Yes	72%

Alternative/ESE Center	Charter School	Minority Rate
No	No	69%

School Grades History

2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11
D	C	B	A

SIP Authority and Template

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

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, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridacims.org. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

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. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. 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: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
  - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
  - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
  - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
  - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
  - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Focus Year 1	3	Ella Thompson

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School
Crystal Lake Elementary School

Principal
Anna Marie Dicesare

School Advisory Council chair
Mrs. Shauna Bergwall

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
Mrs. Anna Marie Dicesare	Interim Principal
Ms. Suzette Vertrees	Assistant Principal
Mrs. Rochelle Grooms	Certified, School Counselor
Mrs. Shauna Bergwall	Title 1 Program Facilitator
Mrs. Michelle Casper	Title 1 Math/Science Resource Teacher
Mrs. Sherry Pittman	Reading Coach
Mr. Geoff Freebern	School Psychologist

District-Level Information

District
Polk

Superintendent
Dr. Kathryn Leroy

Date of school board approval of SIP
10/22/2013

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

The SAC is composed of the Principal and an appropriate balanced number of teachers, non-instructional staff, parents and community members. The SAC is facilitated by the SAC chair and officers consisting of a District SAC Liaison and a SAC Recording Secretary. The membership of the SAC represents the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school.

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

The SAC chair served as a member of the school improvement planning committee. The chair attended both the district SIP orientation meetings and the state Differentiated Accountability training. The planning committee met periodically with the task of developing the SIP using the 8-step problem-solving

model. The SAC chair was involved in this process. The final draft of the SIP was presented to the SAC at its initial meeting for approval prior to submission to the district.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

The SAC will meet monthly on the following focus areas:
• Teacher Recognition Programs
• District Advisory Committee Representation
• Monthly meetings
• Purchase supplies and resources needed for both Extended Learning and Parent Engagement.

Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project

Purchase of supplies for Extended Learning Initiatives - $1,500.00
Purchase supplies for Parental Involvement Programs to address At-Risk subgroups - $2,000.00

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC

In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

N/A

Highly Qualified Staff

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

of administrators

2

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Anna Marie Dicesare

Principal	Years as Administrator:	Years at Current School:

Credentials

Performance Record

Suzette Vertrees		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 7	Years at Current School: 1

Credentials	BS – Early Childhood – Southern Connecticut State University M.Ed. – Elementary Education - Southern Connecticut State University Seventh Year Certificate in Educational Leadership - Southern Connecticut State University
Performance Record	2012-2013: Grade: D, Reading Mastery: 44%, Math Mastery: 36%, Science Mastery: 36%, Writing Mastery: 43%. Learning Gains – Reading: 57%, Math 55%, Lowest 25% - Reading 57%, Math 55%. AMO Reading: 44%. Subgroups: 80% - American Indian, 50% - Asian, 33% - Black, 51% - White, 41% - Hispanic, 19% - ELL, 18% - SWD, and 39% - Econ. Disadvantaged. No student subgroup met the AMO target. AMO Math: 36%. Subgroups: 40% - American Indian, 38% - Asian, 23% - Black, 42% - White, 40% - Hispanic, 22% - ELL, 19% - SWD, and 32% - Econ. Disadvantaged. Asian students met the AMO target for Math through Safe Harbor. 2011-2012: Grade: C, Reading Mastery: 43%, Math Mastery: 32%, Science Mastery: 29%, Writing Mastery: 76%. Learning Gains – Reading: 60%, Math 52%, Lowest 25% - Reading 59%, Math 59%. AMO Reading: 43%. Subgroups: 58% - Asian, 31% - Black, 50% - White, 42% - Hispanic, 23% - ELL, 18% - SWD, and 40% - Econ. Disadvantaged. No sub group met the AMO target for Reading. AMO Math: 32%. Subgroups: 25% - Asian, 21% - Black, 37% - White, 34% - Hispanic, 17% - ELL, 17% - SWD, and 29% - Econ. Disadvantaged. Asian students met the AMO target for Math through Safe Harbor. 2010-2011: Grade: B, Reading Mastery: 59%, Math Mastery: 49%, Science Mastery: 39%, Writing Mastery: 80%. Learning Gains – Reading: 64%, Math 62%, Lowest 25% - Reading 72%, Math 71%. AYP: 87%, White, Hispanic and Econ. Disadvantaged subgroups made AYP in Reading. Hispanic students made AYP in Math. 8th grade students made AYP in Writing. 2009-2010: Grade: C, Reading Mastery: 53%, Math Mastery: 51%, Science Mastery: 34%, Writing Mastery: 88%. Learning Gains – Reading: 61%, Math 66%, Lowest 25% - Reading 66%, Math 62%. AYP: 69%, No student subgroups met AYP in Reading. No student subgroups met AYP in Math. 8th grade students made AYP in Writing. 2008-2009: Grade: C, Reading Mastery: 54%, Math Mastery: 48%, Science Mastery: 38%, Writing Mastery: 78%. Learning Gains – Reading: 66%, Math 63%, Lowest 25% - Reading 74%, Math 62%. AYP: 74%, Students with Disabilities subgroup made AYP in Reading. Black and Hispanic students made AYP in Math. 8th grade students did not make AYP in Writing. 2007-2008: Grade C, Reading Mastery: 51%, Math Mastery: 45%,

Science Mastery: 29%, Writing Mastery: 84%. Learning Gains – Reading: 63%, Math 68%, Lowest 25% - Reading 76%, Math 67%. AYP: 72%, No student subgroups made AYP in Reading. White students made AYP in Math.
8th grade students made AYP in Writing.
2006-2007: Grade B, Reading Mastery: 48%, Math Mastery: 59%, Science Mastery: 22%, Writing Mastery: 87%. Learning Gains – Reading: 65%, Math 73%, Lowest 25% - Reading 69%, Math 82%. AYP: 72%, Students with disabilities subgroup made AYP in Reading. No student subgroups made AYP in Math.
8th grade students made AYP in Writing.

Instructional Coaches

# of instructional coaches

1

 # receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Sherry Pittman		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 8	Years at Current School: 8

Areas	Reading/Literacy
Credentials	BS – Elementary Education, University of South Florida, Certification – Reading Endorsement, State of Florida
Performance Record	2012-2013: Grade: C, Reading Mastery: 38%, Math Mastery: 35%, Science Mastery: 34%, Writing Mastery: 64%. Learning Gains – Reading: 58%, Math 53%, Lowest 25% - Reading 61%, Math 59%. AMO Reading: 38%. Subgroups: 15% - Black, 50% - White, 48% - Hispanic, 35% - ELL, 0% - SWD, and 36% - Econ. Disadvantaged. Hispanic students met the AMO goal for Reading through Safe Harbor. 2011-2012: Grade: B, Reading Mastery: 35%, Math Mastery: 36%, Science Mastery: 29%, Writing Mastery: 75%. Learning Gains – Reading: 65%, Math 59%, Lowest 25% - Reading 59%, Math 52%. AMO Reading: 35%. Subgroups: 21% - Black, 51% - White, 37% - Hispanic, 22% - ELL, 15% - SWD, and 33% - Econ. Disadvantaged. No sub group met the AMO target for Reading. 2010-2011: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 62%, Math Mastery: 69%, Science Mastery: 43%, Writing Mastery: 92%. Learning Gains – Reading: 73%, Math 59%, Lowest 25% - Reading 80%, Math 50%. AYP: 77%, Black, White, and Hispanic subgroups did not make AYP in Reading. Black and Hispanic subgroups did not make AYP in Math, White students made AYP in Math; Econ. Disadvantaged students did not make AYP in both Reading and Math. 4th grade students made AYP in Writing with 100%. 2009-2010: Grade: C, Reading Mastery: 60%, Math Mastery: 71%, Science Mastery: 33%, Writing Mastery: 89%. Learning Gains – Reading: 65%, Math 67%, Lowest 25% - Reading 43%, Math 60%. AYP: 87%, Black and White subgroups did not make AYP in both Reading and Math; The Hispanic subgroup made AYP in both Reading and Math; Econ. Disadvantaged students made AYP in both Reading and Math. 4th grade students made AYP in Writing with 100%. 2008-2009: Grade: C, Reading Mastery: 58%, Math Mastery: 64%, Science Mastery: 23%, Writing Mastery: 92%. Learning Gains – Reading: 62%, Math 70%, Lowest 25% - Reading 55%, Math 69%. AYP: 90%, Black and Econ. Disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in Reading; Hispanic subgroup did not make AYP in Math. White and Hispanic subgroups made AYP in Reading, White, Black and Econ. Disadvantaged subgroups made AYP in Math. 4th grade students made AYP in Writing with 100%. 2007-2008: Grade C, Reading Mastery: 55%, Math Mastery: 64%, Science Mastery: 19%, Writing Mastery: 81%. Learning Gains – Reading: 58%, Math 64%, Lowest 25% - Reading 77%, Math 63%. AYP: 74%, White, Black, Hispanic and Econ. Disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in Reading, Black, Hispanic and

Econ. Disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in Math. Only the White subgroup made AYP in Math. 4th grade students did not make AYP in Writing with 89% from 94%.

Classroom Teachers

# of classroom teachers
43

 # receiving effective rating or higher
43, 100%

 # Highly Qualified Teachers
100%

 # certified in-field
43, 100%

 # ESOL endorsed
27, 63%

 # reading endorsed
7, 16%

 # with advanced degrees
12, 28%

 # National Board Certified
0, 0%

 # first-year teachers
2, 5%

 # with 1-5 years of experience
12, 28%

 # with 6-14 years of experience
23, 53%

 # with 15 or more years of experience
6, 14%

Education Paraprofessionals

# of paraprofessionals
13

 # Highly Qualified
13, 100%

Other Instructional Personnel

# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above
3

 # receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

The school recruits highly qualified staff through both job fairs and the use of our District's RHS on-line recruitment process. The school principal serves as a school district recruiter and attends job fairs throughout the country, looking for highly qualified applicants for both the school and other schools in the district. Teachers new to the school are paired with other tenured teachers to the school. The school encourages both professional and social learning opportunities for all staff designed to promote positive morale and growth.

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

The mentor(s) & mentee meet periodically in order to complete the following:
• Required effective focused instructional strategies.
(Authentic Literacy, Writing, & Vocabulary Instruction)
• First Year Teacher Program
(Classroom Management, Organization, Professional Development, & Teacher Evaluation Program.)
• Assist New Teachers assigned to the school with specific needs. (i.e – Curriculum concerns, supplies issues, etc.)

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI)

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

The MTSS Leadership Team will have focus meetings on how to improve school/teacher effectiveness and student achievement using the Problem Solving Model.
The MTSS Leadership Team will meet at least once per month (or more frequently as needed) to engage in the following activities:
• Review school-wide, grade level, and teacher data to problem solve needed interventions on a systemic level and identify students meeting/exceeding benchmarks as well as those at moderate or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. This will be done bi-weekly if new data is available.
• Help referring teachers design feasible strategies and interventions for struggling students by collaborating regularly, problem solving, sharing effective practices, evaluating implementation, assist in making decisions for school, teacher, student improvement.
• Facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.
• Focus on improving student achievement outcomes with evidence based interventions implemented with fidelity and frequent progress monitoring.
• Intervention teams also foster a sense of collegiality and mutual support among educators, promote the use of evidence-based interventions, and support teachers in carrying out intervention plans.

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

1. Anna Maria Dicesare – Principal - Administrator
2. Suzette Vertrees – Assistant Principal - Administrator
3. Michelle Casper – Title 1 Math/Resource – Support Coach and Monitor MTSS Behavior
4. Sherry Pittman – Title 1 Reading Coach
5. Shauna Bergwall – Title 1 Program Facilitator – Tier 2 Support
6. Geoff Freebern – School Psychologist – Student Evaluator
7. Rochelle Grooms – Guidance Counselor – MTSS – Academic Support
8. Angelica Perez – ESOL Teacher – ELL Program
9. Sharon Phelps – Speech Pathologist

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

Members of the MTSS Leadership Team meet with the Principal to develop the SIP. The members provide data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needs to be addressed; set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitates the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures. The members of the MTSS team utilize the problem solving model in order to meet school needs. Subgroups of students are analyzed and discussed to identify obstacles and barriers, analyze problems associated with such, implement a plan of action, and evaluate outcomes to ensure student achievement

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

Baseline data is gathered through August and September. Discovery Learning Math data is processed through a web based application for grades K – 5. Kindergarten, First, and Second Grade data is also processed through FAIR via a web based application. First and Second Grade instructional data is gathered from the previous year SAT 10. Third through Fifth Grade instructional data is gathered from the previous year's FCAT scores. Progress Monitoring data is gathered mid-year and toward the end of the year. Discovery Learning data is processed three times per year. Other Progress Monitoring data is collected as needed for classroom or student progress. This information may be obtained by probes, Fluency checks, etc. Diagnostic Assessment data is gathered through the Discovery Learning and DAR. End of Year data is gathered through Discovery Learning, SAT 10, FCAT, and end of the year teacher/ district formative assessments. Data is discussed and analyzed at least monthly at the MTSS Leadership Team Meetings.

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

The MTSS Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor the entire MTSS process. The focus will be to lend support to teachers and parents on the implementation process, review data to ensure fidelity and to secure resources that will enable students in both Tier 2 and Tier 3 to become successful students at Crystal Lake Elementary.

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Before or After School Program

Minutes added to school year: 30

The school incorporates the reading supplemental program, FastForward, designed to assist students who experience difficulty in reading. The program is given to students in Grades 1-3 for 30-min. before the school day. Students receive interventions that are specific to their individual deficiencies. The program is a web-based program, which is also available to students in classrooms. The fidelity of the program is done by both the school's Reading coach along with a paraprofessional assigned to work with the coach.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

The data is collected monthly and discussed with members of the school Leadership Team via Weekly Leadership Team Meetings. The results taken from the reports generated from Fastforward are compared to both the district on-going progress reports and school formative teacher assessments.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

The Reading Coach and School Principal.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

Name	Title
Suzette Vertrees	Assistant Principal
Shauna Bergwall	Title 1, Program Facilitator
Sherry Pittman	Reading Coach
Christina Salas	Teacher, Primary
Janet Smith	Teacher, Intermediate

How the school-based LLT functions

• Professional Development based on instructional needs in the area of Reading for the school
• Will be used as a professional learning community to conduct a lesson study in the area of Reading.
• Plan school events that highlight reading
Collaboration of team members to seamlessly integrate Reading in all areas school-wide (i.e. Accelerated Reader, Media Events, etc…)

Major initiatives of the LLT

Initiate a rewards based program to ensure that Accelerated Reader is being implemented with fidelity. Analyze data to determine vocabulary and additional learning strategies to move students scoring at Achievement Level 2 on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) to Achievement Level 3 or above.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

N/A - Elementary School

Preschool Transition

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(G) and 1115(c)(1)(D), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs

Florida requires that communities collaborate to prepare children and families for children's success in school. Crystal Lake supports the transition from preschool to elementary school in many ways. Our school has 2 Head Start units each staffed with 1 Head Start Teacher and 1 CDAT paraprofessional; 2 ESE Pre-kindergarten units staffed with certified teachers and highly qualified paraprofessionals. Our Head Start class is part of the Polk Pre-K School Readiness program built on the premise of quality early childhood education, designed to provide a safe and nurturing environment that promotes the physical, social, emotional and cognitive development of young children while responding to the needs of the families. Child Find is available to assist families of preschoolers with low readiness rates. The following three government-supplemented programs emphasizing school readiness are available in our area: Head Start, School Readiness Program, Florida Voluntary Pre-K Program and Youth and Family Alternatives, Inc. Our Kindergarten staff works closely with the pre-kindergarten and area preschool providers to insure a smooth transition-to-school. Our pre-kindergarten classes and area preschools are invited to tour our school and kindergarten classrooms. Kindergarten Teachers as well as office staff collaborate to offer a "Kindergarten Round Up" conducted in the spring of every school year to introduce the incoming kindergartners and parents to Crystal Lake Elementary. Newsletters, flyers and other important information are sent home to our Pre-K students and families announcing happenings and expectations for school. Pre-K parents have the opportunity to visit the school and receive handouts dealing with kindergarten expectations. Kindergarten students are assessed using the FLKRS process throughout the school year. This data is used to indicate the students' development and readiness for school as well as monitoring progress. 90% of students screened using SRUSS and in 2012 at Crystal Lake Elementary were within the range of what is expected for children of this age level. Our school allocates funds from our Title 1 budget to implement activities to help with the transition from Pre-K to Kindergarten. Parent surveys and evaluation components are used to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the plan and transition programs.

College and Career Readiness

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future

N/A - Elementary School

How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful

N/A - Elementary School

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

N/A - Elementary School

Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	52%	38%	No	57%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	38%	15%	No	45%
Hispanic	57%	48%	No	61%
White	64%	50%	No	68%
English language learners	42%	35%	No	48%
Students with disabilities	38%	0%	No	44%
Economically disadvantaged	51%	36%	No	56%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	47	22%	32%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	33	15%	25%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	126	58%	80%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	18	61%	80%

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	46	49%	55%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	22	24%	35%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	16	17%	25%

Postsecondary Readiness

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.			

Area 2: Writing

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	40	66%	75%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		0%

Area 3: Mathematics

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 and EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	53%	35%	No	57%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	37%	25%	No	43%
Hispanic	58%	44%	No	63%
White	62%	32%	No	66%
English language learners	46%	39%	No	51%
Students with disabilities	38%	10%	No	44%
Economically disadvantaged	51%	36%	No	56%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	47	22%	31%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	25	11%	23%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	129	53%	80%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	18	59%	80%

Area 4: Science

Elementary School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		23%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	15	22%	22%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6			
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)

All Levels

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	7		10
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	196	100%	100%

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses			
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more *accelerated* courses			
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in *accelerated* courses			
Students taking CTE industry certification exams			
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams			
CTE program concentrators			
CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications			

Area 7: Social Studies

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

Elementary School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	206	45%	32%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	33	7%	4%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	27	32%	20%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	74	16%	12%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	56	12%	9%

Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Parental involvement targets for the school

School will use Parent Involvement Plan to meet requirements.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Parent Nights	6	100%	100%

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

Specific Additional Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %

Goals Summary

G1. Incorporate writing across the curriculum strategies in all grade levels in order to increase proficiency levels of students in Grades K-5.

G2. All teachers will utilize higher order thinking skills with fidelity in order to help increase the level of proficiency of all students in reading to meet AMO goal targets.

G3. All teachers will implement high quality instructional delivery via the Gradual Release Model including strategies and accommodations for students who didn't make the AMO targets.

Goals Detail

G1. Incorporate writing across the curriculum strategies in all grade levels in order to increase proficiency levels of students in Grades K-5.

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA)

- Writing

- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains)

- Science

- Science - Elementary School

- STEM

- STEM - All Levels

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Reading Wonders

- Polk Writes

- Lincoln Academy Process Writing

- District OGA's

- Practice FCAT Tests

- District Writing Coach

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Student Lack of Understanding of Conventions in Writing

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Review of progress of 4th Grade Students toward target goals

Person or Persons Responsible
Administration

Target Dates or Schedule:
Leadership Team Meetings, September & December

Evidence of Completion:
Data results from On-going assessments, Leadership Team Meeting Notes.

G2. All teachers will utilize higher order thinking skills with fidelity in order to help increase the level of proficiency of all students in reading to meet AMO goal targets.

Targets Supported
- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, Learning Gains, CELLA)

Resources Available to Support the Goal
- SRA
- Reading Coaches (School and District)
- Reading Wonders Basal
- Title 1 Resources
- CISM Strategies
- Extended Reading Passages
- Extra Time For Tier 2 and Tier 3 Students
- CARS/STARS/FOCUS Books
- Accelerated Reader Program
- ESOL Teacher For ELL Students

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal
- Lack of Understanding of Higher Order Thinking Processes

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

On-going Assessments

Person or Persons Responsible
Leadership team

Target Dates or Schedule:
October, December, May (Assessment Window)

Evidence of Completion:
Data Reports, Leadership Conversation Notes.

G3. All teachers will implement high quality instructional delivery via the Gradual Release Model including strategies and accommodations for students who didn't make the AMO targets.

Targets Supported
- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA)

- Writing

- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains)

- Science

- Science - Elementary School

- STEM

- STEM - All Levels

Resources Available to Support the Goal
- SRA

- Coaches (School and District)

- Reading Wonders Basal

- Title 1 Resources

- CISM Strategies

- Extended Reading Passages

- Extra Time For Tier 2 and Tier 3 Students

- CARS/STARS/FOCUS Books

- Accelerated Reader Program

- ESOL Teacher For ELL Students

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal
- Instructional Delivery (Missing Elements)

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

On-going Assessments

Person or Persons Responsible
Leadership team

Target Dates or Schedule:
October, December, May (Assessment Window)

Evidence of Completion:
Data Reports, Leadership Conversation Notes.

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

    G = Goal   **B** = Barrier   **S** = Strategy

G1. Incorporate writing across the curriculum strategies in all grade levels in order to increase proficiency levels of students in Grades K-5.

G1.B3 Student Lack of Understanding of Conventions in Writing

G1.B3.S2 Writing Across the Curriculum

Action Step 1

PD on How To Model Writing Across the Curriculum

Person or Persons Responsible

District Coach & Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

By Oct. 2013

Evidence of Completion

Teacher Sign-in

Facilitator:

District Coach

Participants:

K-5 Teachers

Action Step 2

Use of Writing Across The Curriculum

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going

Evidence of Completion

Teacher Observations, Collaborative Planning Sheets & Student Writing Journals

Action Step 3

Observation of Writing Across the Curriculum

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going

Evidence of Completion

Student Writing Journals

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B3.S2

Teachers will require students to write to summarize and write to explain and/or justify expressions via student writing journals. This will be on-going throughout the year.

Person or Persons Responsible

District Coach & Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going

Evidence of Completion

Administration will observe teachers to determine how both professional development and implementation of this strategy is done

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B3.S2

Will meet to determine if the strategy is effective

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration & Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

September, December, January in Collaborative Team Meetings

Evidence of Completion

Review of Student Writing Journals. Goal: 33% of 4th Grade Students Writing Papers of 3.5 or higher – Samples - September 50% of 4th Grade Students Writing Papers of 3.5 or higher – Samples – December 75% of 4th Grade Students Writing Papers of 3.5 or higher – Samples - January

G1.B3.S4 Use Rubrics

Action Step 1

Collaborative Meetings on the Use of Rubrics to Grade Student Writing Samples

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going

Evidence of Completion

Collaborative Planning Sheets & Student Work Samples

Action Step 2

Grading Student Work Samples Using Rubrics

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going

Evidence of Completion

Student Work Samples

Action Step 3

Review of Student Work Samples

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going

Evidence of Completion

Student Work Samples

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B3.S4

Will meet in collaborative teams to discuss how rubrics will be used in grading student writing samples. Teachers use rubrics to grade papers according to both narrative and expository styles. Teachers will exchange classes and compare how student papers are graded across teachers.

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going

Evidence of Completion

Administration will observe teachers to determine how both professional development and implementation of this strategy is done

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B3.S4

Will meet to determine if the strategy is effective

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration & Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

September, December, January in Collaborative Team Meetings

Evidence of Completion

Goal: 33% of 4th Grade Students Writing Papers of 3.5 or higher – Samples - September 50% of 4th Grade Students Writing Papers of 3.5 or higher – Samples – December 75% of 4th Grade Students Writing Papers of 3.5 or higher – Samples - January

G1.B3.S7 Use of Error Analysis With Sentences

Action Step 1

Collaborative Meetings on the approaches of the Error Analysis process

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going

Evidence of Completion

Collaborative Planning Sheets & Student Work Samples

Action Step 2

Use of Error Analysis in Writing

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going

Evidence of Completion

Teacher Observations, Collaborative Planning Sheets & Student Writing Samples

Action Step 3

Observation of the Use of Error Analysis

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going

Evidence of Completion

Teacher Walk thrus

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B3.S7

Will meet in collaborative teams to discuss how Error Analysis is incorporated in Writing. Teachers will teach students how to determine errors in writing as it relates to grammar, punctuation, spelling, etc.

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going

Evidence of Completion

Administration will observe teachers to determine how both professional development and implementation of this strategy is done.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B3.S7

Will meet to determine if the strategy is effective

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration & Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

September, December, January in Collaborative Team Meetings

Evidence of Completion

Review of Student Writing Papers Goal: 33% of 4th Grade Students Writing Papers of 3.5 or higher – Samples - September 50% of 4th Grade Students Writing Papers of 3.5 or higher – Samples – December 75% of 4th Grade Students Writing Papers of 3.5 or higher – Samples - January

G2. All teachers will utilize higher order thinking skills with fidelity in order to help increase the level of proficiency of all students in reading to meet AMO goal targets.

G2.B5 Lack of Understanding of Higher Order Thinking Processes

G2.B5.S1 Use of Webb's Depth of Knowledge

Action Step 1

Secure Materials From the District on Webb's Depth of Knowledge

Person or Persons Responsible

School-based Leadership Team, Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Sept. 2013

Evidence of Completion

Depth of Knowledge Materials

Facilitator:

Reading Coach

Participants:

K-5 Grade Teachers

Action Step 2

Deliver PD on the Use of Webb's Depth of Knowledge

Person or Persons Responsible

School-based Coaches & District PD Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

October, 2013

Evidence of Completion

Result-Based Collaborative Planning Forms

Facilitator:

Reading Coach & District Coaches

Participants:

K-5 Grade Teachers

Action Step 3

Monitor & support Teachers utilizing the Webb's Depth of Knowledge Model.

Person or Persons Responsible

School-based Coaches & Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Administrative Observations

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B5.S1

Design & Deliver PD on Webb's Depth of Knowledge and have teachers implement strategy in classrooms

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration & School-based Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

October, 2013

Evidence of Completion

Teacher Observations, Collaborative Forms & Sign-in Sheets

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B5.S1

Design & Deliver PD on Webb's Depth of Knowledge and have teachers implement strategy in classrooms.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and School Based Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

October, 2013

Evidence of Completion

Grade Level Presentation of Collaborative Plans matched with Formative Assessments of Students. FAIR Testing: August: 25% all students scoring proficient. December: 45% all students scoring proficient. March: 65% all students scoring proficient.

G2.B5.S3 Collaborative Planning Utilizing HOT Strategies

Action Step 1

Plan together on the use of HOT Strategy Elements in Instruction. Utilize strategies taken from Book Studies In Math & Reading.

Person or Persons Responsible

All Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly During Planning Meetings

Evidence of Completion

Collaborative Planning Forms, Student Work Samples, Lesson Plans, & Teacher Observations.

Facilitator:

Administration

Participants:

All Teachers

Action Step 2

Teacher Implementation of Higher Order Strategies

Person or Persons Responsible

All Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going throughout the Year

Evidence of Completion

Teacher Walkthrus & Lesson Plans.

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B5.S3

Implementation of Elements of HOT questions in classrooms & monitor through teacher observations.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going throughout the School Year

Evidence of Completion

Administrative Walkthrus, Lesson Plan Checks & DA Visits.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B5.S3

Administration & Coaches will review both on-going assessment and classroom observations of teachers implementing elements of HOT questions in classroom.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and School Based Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly for Leadership Team Meetings.

Evidence of Completion

Observations of Teachers, collaborative planning logs and review of lesson plans. December: 50% all students demonstrating learning gains from the 1st to the 2nd assessment in reading. March: 80% all students demonstrating learning gains from the 1st assessment to the 3rd assessment in Reading.

G2.B5.S6 Assessment of HOT Question effectiveness

Action Step 1

Formative Assessments

Person or Persons Responsible

All Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Daily

Evidence of Completion

Student Portfolios, Assessments, Lesson Plans, Student Report Card Results

Action Step 2

Report of Progress of Teachers Using HOT Strategies

Person or Persons Responsible

Leadership Team

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Observation Reports from Classroom Walk thrus.

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B5.S6

Review of Student Assessment Results of Teachers utilizing HOT techniques

Person or Persons Responsible

Coaches & Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Teacher observation notes & Formative Assessments .

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B5.S6

Analysis of Student Assessment Results by Teachers utilizing HOT techniques each month.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and School Based Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Coaching Log Reports and Formative Assessments. Nov. 25% all students demonstrating understanding of reading content using higher order thinking strategies. Feb.: 50% all students demonstrating understanding of reading content using higher order thinking strategies.. May: 80% all students demonstrating understanding of reading content using higher order thinking strategies.

G3. All teachers will implement high quality instructional delivery via the Gradual Release Model including strategies and accommodations for students who didn't make the AMO targets.

G3.B1 Instructional Delivery (Missing Elements)

G3.B1.S1 Collaborative Planning

Action Step 1

Provide Teachers with PD on How to Plan Collaboratively

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration & Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Aug. 28, 2013

Evidence of Completion

Teacher Sign-in sheets

Facilitator:

Title 1 Program Faciliatator

Participants:

K-5 Teachers

Action Step 2

Teachers Planning Together in Grade Level Teams

Person or Persons Responsible

All Teachers – K-5

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Result-Based Collaborative Planning Forms

Action Step 3

Provide support to Teachers During Planning Process

Person or Persons Responsible

Leadership Team

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Administrative Observations

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B1.S1

Collaborative Planning Process

Person or Persons Responsible

Leadership Team, Grade Level Chairs & Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly Observations & 1st of the Month (Forms)

Evidence of Completion

Teacher Observations, Collaborative Forms & Sign-in Sheets

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B1.S1

Collaborative Planning Process Discussions on Effectiveness.

Person or Persons Responsible

Leadership Team

Target Dates or Schedule

Bi-Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Grade Level Presentation of Collaborative Plans matched with Formative Assessments of Students. Goal: 100% of All Teachers having High Quality Plans by December, 2013.

G3.B1.S2 Develop Expectations For Instructional Delivery

Action Step 1

Provide Teachers with PD on the DA Elements

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration & Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Aug. 14, 2013

Evidence of Completion

Power points & Sign-in sheets

Facilitator:

Principal & Members of DA School Committee

Participants:

Grade K-5 Teachers

Action Step 2

Teacher Implementation of the DA Elements

Person or Persons Responsible

All Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going throughout the Year

Evidence of Completion

Teacher Walkthrus & Lesson Plans

Action Step 3

Provide Teachers with Follow up Training on DA Elements

Person or Persons Responsible

All Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going Dependent on Teacher Needs

Evidence of Completion

Power points & Sign-in sheets

Facilitator:

Math Resource Coach

Participants:

K-5 Teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B1.S2

Implementation of Elements outlined in the DA Checklist

Person or Persons Responsible

DA Coaches & Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going throughout the School Year

Evidence of Completion

Administrative Walkthrus, Lesson Plan Checks & DA Visits

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B1.S2

Implementation of DA Elements in Classrooms

Person or Persons Responsible

Leadership Team & DA Coaches

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly for Leadership Team & Conferencing visit per DA team

Evidence of Completion

DA Checklists of Classroom Walk thrus, DA Team Observation Notes & Classroom Data. Goal: 100% of Teachers Implementing DA Elements in Classrooms by April, 2014.

G3.B1.S3 Use of the Gradual Release Model

Action Step 1

Provide Teachers with a Refresher on The GRM

Person or Persons Responsible

Reading Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Sept., 2013

Evidence of Completion

Sign-in sheets & Power point.

Facilitator:

Reading Coach

Participants:

Grade K-5 Teachers

Action Step 2

Modeling of the GRM to Staff

Person or Persons Responsible

Reading Coach

Target Dates or Schedule

Sept. – Oct., 2013

Evidence of Completion

Observations

Action Step 3

Implementation of the GRM Process

Person or Persons Responsible

All Teachers – K-5

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going

Evidence of Completion

Teacher Walkthru Observations & Lesson Plans

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B1.S3

Use of the GRM in all classrooms.

Person or Persons Responsible

Coaches & Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

During Classroom visits

Evidence of Completion

Lesson Plans, both coaching and Administration visits.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B1.S3

Effective Use of the GRM to improve the Instructional Delivery

Person or Persons Responsible

Leadership Team

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly Leadership Team Meetings

Evidence of Completion

Coaches Visits & Administrative Walk thrus. Goal: 100% of Teachers Implementing The Gradual Release Model by December, 2013.

Coordination and Integration

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part A, funds school-wide services to Crystal Lake Elementary. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. This program supports after-school and summer instructional programs, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, technology for students, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III to ensure that staff development needs are addressed accordingly.
Title II
Professional development resources are available to all schools through Title II funds. In addition, School Technology Services provide technical support, technology training, and licenses for software programs and web-based access via Title II-D funds as made available. Funds available to Crystal Lake Elementary are used to purchase supplies and provide substitutes for teachers who participate in professional development activities.
Title III
Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, as well as professional learning opportunities for school staff.
Violence Prevention Programs
Crystal Lake Elementary provides violence and drug prevention programs in order to promote a safe school environment. Examples of violence prevention programs include anti-bullying, gang awareness, gun awareness, etc.
Nutrition Programs
Crystal Lake Elementary is a location for a summer feeding program for the community.
Head Start
Head Start is located on our campus. Resources are provided to the program to assist in the transition of students from Pre-K to kindergarten. Head Start teachers may participate in professional learning opportunities offered to school staff, and they are involved in Professional Learning Community activities with kindergarten teachers. Parents of Head Start students are invited to participate in parent workshops and activities provided by the school.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Incorporate writing across the curriculum strategies in all grade levels in order to increase proficiency levels of students in Grades K-5.

G1.B3 Student Lack of Understanding of Conventions in Writing

G1.B3.S2 Writing Across the Curriculum

PD Opportunity 1

PD on How To Model Writing Across the Curriculum

Facilitator

District Coach

Participants

K-5 Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

By Oct. 2013

Evidence of Completion

Teacher Sign-in

G2. All teachers will utilize higher order thinking skills with fidelity in order to help increase the level of proficiency of all students in reading to meet AMO goal targets.

G2.B5 Lack of Understanding of Higher Order Thinking Processes

G2.B5.S1 Use of Webb's Depth of Knowledge

PD Opportunity 1

Secure Materials From the District on Webb's Depth of Knowledge

Facilitator

Reading Coach

Participants

K-5 Grade Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Sept. 2013

Evidence of Completion

Depth of Knowledge Materials

PD Opportunity 2

Deliver PD on the Use of Webb's Depth of Knowledge

Facilitator

Reading Coach & District Coaches

Participants

K-5 Grade Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October, 2013

Evidence of Completion

Result-Based Collaborative Planning Forms

G2.B5.S3 Collaborative Planning Utilizing HOT Strategies

PD Opportunity 1

Plan together on the use of HOT Strategy Elements in Instruction. Utilize strategies taken from Book Studies In Math & Reading.

Facilitator

Administration

Participants

All Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly During Planning Meetings

Evidence of Completion

Collaborative Planning Forms, Student Work Samples, Lesson Plans, & Teacher Observations.

G3. All teachers will implement high quality instructional delivery via the Gradual Release Model including strategies and accommodations for students who didn't make the AMO targets.

G3.B1 Instructional Delivery (Missing Elements)

G3.B1.S1 Collaborative Planning

PD Opportunity 1

Provide Teachers with PD on How to Plan Collaboratively

Facilitator

Title 1 Program Faciliatator

Participants

K-5 Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Aug. 28, 2013

Evidence of Completion

Teacher Sign-in sheets

G3.B1.S2 Develop Expectations For Instructional Delivery

PD Opportunity 1

Provide Teachers with PD on the DA Elements

Facilitator

Principal & Members of DA School Committee

Participants

Grade K-5 Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Aug. 14, 2013

Evidence of Completion

Power points & Sign-in sheets

PD Opportunity 2

Provide Teachers with Follow up Training on DA Elements

Facilitator

Math Resource Coach

Participants

K-5 Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going Dependent on Teacher Needs

Evidence of Completion

Power points & Sign-in sheets

G3.B1.S3 Use of the Gradual Release Model

PD Opportunity 1

Provide Teachers with a Refresher on The GRM

Facilitator

Reading Coach

Participants

Grade K-5 Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Sept., 2013

Evidence of Completion

Sign-in sheets & Power point.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
G2.	All teachers will utilize higher order thinking skills with fidelity in order to help increase the level of proficiency of all students in reading to meet AMO goal targets.	$2,000
G3.	All teachers will implement high quality instructional delivery via the Gradual Release Model including strategies and accommodations for students who didn't make the AMO targets.	$180,000
	Total	$182,000

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Professional Development	Personnel	Total
District Funds	$0	$0	$0
School Operating Funds	$2,000	$0	$2,000
Title 1	$0	$180,000	$180,000
District	$0	$0	$0
Total	$2,000	$180,000	$182,000

Budget Details

Budget items identified in the SIP as necessary to achieve the school's goals.

G2. All teachers will utilize higher order thinking skills with fidelity in order to help increase the level of proficiency of all students in reading to meet AMO goal targets.

G2.B5 Lack of Understanding of Higher Order Thinking Processes

G2.B5.S1 Use of Webb's Depth of Knowledge

Action Step 1

Secure Materials From the District on Webb's Depth of Knowledge

Resource Type

Professional Development

Resource

Webb's handouts, Powerpoints, etc.

Funding Source

District Funds

Amount Needed

$0

Action Step 2

Deliver PD on the Use of Webb's Depth of Knowledge

Resource Type

Personnel

Resource

District PD Personnel

Funding Source

District

Amount Needed

$0

G2.B5.S3 Collaborative Planning Utilizing HOT Strategies

Action Step 1

Plan together on the use of HOT Strategy Elements in Instruction. Utilize strategies taken from Book Studies In Math & Reading.

Resource Type

Professional Development

Resource

Books for Book Study PLC's in Math & Reading

Funding Source

School Operating Funds

Amount Needed

$2,000

G3. All teachers will implement high quality instructional delivery via the Gradual Release Model including strategies and accommodations for students who didn't make the AMO targets.

G3.B1 Instructional Delivery (Missing Elements)

G3.B1.S1 Collaborative Planning

Action Step 1

Provide Teachers with PD on How to Plan Collaboratively

Resource Type

Personnel

Resource

Title 1 Program Facilitator

Funding Source

Title 1

Amount Needed

$60,000

G3.B1.S2 Develop Expectations For Instructional Delivery

Action Step 3

Provide Teachers with Follow up Training on DA Elements

Resource Type

Personnel

Resource

School - based Coaches

Funding Source

Title 1

Amount Needed

$120,000