Cracker Trail Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cracker Trail Elementary School

8200 SPARTA RD, Sebring, FL 33875

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~cte/

Demographics

Principal: Richard Kogelschatz

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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 (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (55%)
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 Highlands 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

Cracker Trail Elementary School

8200 SPARTA RD, Sebring, FL 33875

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~cte/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	96%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Highlands 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 Develop Lifelong Learners and Leaders"

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Leading Together To Achieve Excellence"

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
Kogelschatz, Rick	Principal	
Brooker, Sarah	Assistant Principal	
Eures, Katherine	Instructional Coach	
Thomas, Heather	School Counselor	
White, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	
Prendergast, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
Schult, Krista	Teacher, K-12	
Thomas, Travis	Teacher, K-12	
Pugh-Clogston, Stacey	Teacher, K-12	
Belanger, Ian	Instructional Technology	
Hines, Denise	Teacher, K-12	
Piller, Nancy	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Richard Kogelschatz

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.*

3

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

624

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

0

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

2

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	110	131	115	111	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	599
Attendance below 90 percent	0	23	20	17	17	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	1	9	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	6	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	8	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	2	1	6	34	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	10	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/2/2021

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	6	118	107	129	88	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	586
Attendance below 90 percent	3	9	8	10	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	1	7	1	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	1	28	0	11	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	19	0	8	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	8	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	1	7	1	4	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	6	118	107	129	88	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	586
Attendance below 90 percent	3	9	8	10	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	1	7	1	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	1	28	0	11	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	19	0	8	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	8	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	1	7	1	4	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				53%	50%	57%	52%	48%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	54%	58%	41%	48%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	49%	53%	29%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				56%	57%	63%	63%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	57%	62%	49%	50%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	44%	51%	30%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				57%	45%	53%	60%	52%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	63%	50%	13%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	49%	-5%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	45%	1%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	57%	56%	1%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	55%	60%	-5%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	49%	2%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	55%	43%	12%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA and Math Progress monitoring via iReady Diagnostic.
Risk Level 1 & 2 are considered proficient, Risk Level 3 & 4 are not proficient.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53.5	40.3	50.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	47.9	30.7	43.2
	Students With Disabilities	38.1	14.3	40
	English Language Learners	100	66.7	66.7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58.8	55.5	56.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	54.9	45.3	43.3
	Students With Disabilities	52.4	52.4	56.3
	English Language Learners	33.3	33.3	50

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44	44.2	49.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	40.9	37.7	39.1
	Students With Disabilities	31	24.1	37.9
	English Language Learners	50	75	100
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35.3	40.8	48.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	30.3	34.8	34.1
	Students With Disabilities	31	41.4	43.5
	English Language Learners	0	0	100

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41	45.3	42.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	38.9	34.5
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	44.8
	English Language Learners	25	25	50
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38	36.8	39.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	27.4	29.6	30.9
	Students With Disabilities	34.5	41.4	48.3
	English Language Learners	0	0	50

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39.5	46.7	53.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	36.5	35.1	45.9
	Students With Disabilities	24.1	31	34.5
	English Language Learners	75	50	100
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22.9	28.3	33.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	16.4	25.7	28.4
	Students With Disabilities	27.6	24.1	31
	English Language Learners	0	0	75

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42.2	49.4	53.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.6	35.7	34.1
	Students With Disabilities	42.9	53.6	60.7
	English Language Learners	100	100	100
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37.3	51.8	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.4	31	46.3
	Students With Disabilities	46.4	53.6	60.7
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			57.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			N/A
	Students With Disabilities			40
	English Language Learners			N/A

Subgroup Data Review

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	33	47		40	71		40				
ELL	50			40							
HSP	52	50		52	79		60				
MUL	63			71							
WHT	61	52	50	66	71	73	61				
FRL	49	39		53	66	80	42				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	21	19	22	27	37	32	17				
ELL	15	27		23	50						
BLK	69	79		40	64		54				
HSP	44	43	41	51	57	26	49				
MUL	27	27		40	55						
WHT	55	53	38	60	61	34	64				
FRL	38	44	42	42	50	34	41				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	4	12	13	17	20	19	14				
ELL	9			27							
BLK	43	50		29	22						
HSP	41	30	35	56	46	38	54				
MUL	38	40		50	40						
WHT	57	44	30	68	53	33	67				
FRL	44	38	28	54	49	33	49				

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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	62
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

The ELA learning gains for each subgroup (SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, MUL, WHT, FRL) were below the ESSA target of 41%.

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

ELA scores in 1st, 2nd, and 3rd grade using iReady and FSA data.

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

Kindergarten students are not assigned to CTE's campus - unable to accurately capture students' academic levels. Staff turnover in lower grades.

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

Learning Gains in 4th & 5th grade learning gains in ELA & math.

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

Consistency in staff. PLCs implemented in both areas. Deeper dives in progress monitoring meetings.

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

1. Standards aligned curriculum with fidelity
2. Models of Effective Instruction
3. Implement a collaborative planning framework - Professional Learning Communities

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.

1. Monitoring of use of curriculum materials using district designed curriculum map.
2. Continued development and implementation of Models of Effective Instruction and IPGs.
3. PLC monitoring by administration and support by PLC/Solution Tree representatives.

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

Continued implementation of PLCs in ELA and Math. Planning and monitoring visits from district coaches.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	3rd Grade ELA Proficiency for the school was 52% compared to the District 46% and State 54%. 4th Grade ELA Proficiency for the school was 57% compared to the District 46% and State 52%. 5th Grade ELA Proficiency for the school was 65% compared to the District 48% and State 54%. The proficiency percentage for 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade was higher than the district percentage and higher than the state level in 4th and 5th grade. The need identified based on this data would be learning gains with a focus in the subgroups listed below. Subgroup Rationale: Achievement below 41% Black - 37.5% Learning Gains below 41% SWD - 37.5% ELL - 30.0% Black - 12.5% Hispanic - 21.21% Multiracial - 31.25% White - 30.11% FRL - 24.32%
Measurable Outcome:	In 2021-2022, CTE will increase learning gains by 2% from 54% to 56% in ELA.
Monitoring:	PLC Meetings Progress Monitoring Stocktake Meetings
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katherine Eures (eureska@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Standards aligned curriculum with fidelity 2. Models of Effective Instruction 3. Implement a collaborative planning framework - Professional Learning Communities
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. CKLA curriculum materials available; use district designed curriculum map; 2. Models of Instruction promote student engagement in cognitive & social tasks increasing the student's capabilities to learn more easily and effectively. 3. PLCs provide educators opportunities to directly improve teaching & learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Point People for Focus Area: Katherine Eures and Andrea White
1. ELA Professional Learning Communities
2. ELA Curriculum - Core and Supplemental
3. ELA Professional Development
4. MTSS Interventions and Monitoring
5. Progress Monitoring
6. Effective Instruction Tools - IPG Planning Tool
7. Instructional Coach Support
8. Literacy Committee

All students will make at least one year's worth of growth on i-Ready ELA.

Person Responsible Katherine Eures (eureska@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	3rd Grade ELA Proficiency for the school was 50% compared to the District 50% and State 51%. 4th Grade ELA Proficiency for the school was 63% compared to the District 52% and State 53%. 5th Grade ELA Proficiency for the school was 67% compared to the District 47% and State 51%. The proficiency percentage for 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade was equal to or higher than the district percentage and higher than the state level in 4th and 5th grade. The need identified based on this data would be learning gains with a focus in the subgroups listed below. Subgroup Rationale: Achievement below 41% Black - 37.5% Learning Gains below 41% ELL - 33.33%
Measurable Outcome:	In 2021-2022, Cracker Trail Elementary will increase learning gains by 1% from 70% to 71% in Math.
Monitoring:	PLC Meetings Progress Monitoring Stocktake Meetings
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Travis Thomas (thomast1@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use standards aligned curriculum Models of Effective Instruction Implement a collaborative planning framework - Professional Learning Communities
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Go Math! curriculum materials available; use district designed curriculum map; 2. Models of Instruction promote student engagement in cognitive & social tasks increasing the student's capabilities to learn more easily and effectively. 3. PLCs provide educators opportunities to directly improve teaching & learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Point People for Focus Area: Travis Thomas and Krista Schult
1. Math Professional Learning Communities
2. District Developed Instructional Plans
3. Focused skill instruction
4. Progress Monitoring
5. Effective Instruction Tools - IPG Planning Tool
6. Instructional Coach Support
7. Math Connections Committee

All students will make at least one year's worth of growth on i-Ready Math.

Person Responsible	Travis Thomas (thomast1@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science Achievement for the school was % compared to the District % and State %. Subgroup Rationale: Achievement below 41% ELL - 33.3%
Measurable Outcome:	In 2021-2022, Cracker Trail Elementary will increase proficiency on the Statewide Science Assessments by 1% from 60% to 61%.
Monitoring:	PLC Meetings Progress Monitoring Stocktake Meetings
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Hines (hinesd@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use standards aligned curriculum Models of Effective Instruction Implement a collaborative planning framework - Professional Learning Communities
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. SSA aligned curriculum materials available; use district designed curriculum map; 2. Models of Instruction promote student engagement in cognitive & social tasks increasing the student's capabilities to learn more easily and effectively. 3. PLCs provide educators opportunities to directly improve teaching & learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Point People for Focus Area: Denise Hines and Nancy Piller
1. Science Professional Learning Communities
2. District Developed Instructional Plans
3. Focused skill instruction
4. Progress Monitoring
5. Effective Instruction Tools - IPG Planning Tool
6. Science Connections Committee

Person Responsible   Nancy Piller (pillern@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:	In 2021-2021, 95% of Cracker Trail Elementary School students will earn PBIS events.
Monitoring:	Committee Meetings Progress Monitoring Stocktake Meetings
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Thomas (thomash@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

Point People for Focus Area: Heather Thomas and Stacey Pugh-Clogston

Person Responsible	Heather Thomas (thomash@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:	In 2021-2022, Cracker Trail Elementary School will increase the number of students who attend 90% or more by 2% from 81% to 83%.
Monitoring:	Committee Meetings Progress Monitoring Stocktake Meetings
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ian Belanger (belangei@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

Point People for Focus Area: Ian Belanger and Liz Prendergast

Person Responsible	Ian Belanger (belangei@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

CTE reported .2 incidents per 100 students during the 2019-2020 school year (school incident ranking of #259 - very low). Reported suspensions were 2.2 per 100 students. Using PBIS strategies, the school will continue to monitor behavior during progress monitoring, MTSS Team meetings, and PBIS Meetings.

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.

To increase parent involvement and build positive relationships with families, as well as increase communication to inform parents of their child's progress, we host:
• Open House/Orientation night
• Report Card Conferences with Parents
• PTO Family Nights - Hoe Down
• Science Fair/ Art Showcase
• Fall Character Parade
*Events may be changed or canceled based on guidelines set in response to safety guidelines.

In addition we communicate with families and the community through:
• School & Classroom Websites
• School Facebook Page
• Monthly School Newsletters
• Weekly Classroom Newsletters
• Call-Outs to Families (to communicate important information/reminders)
• iOS & Android APP
• Student planners/Communication folders
• DoJo App
• Remind App
• PTO Meetings
• SAC Meetings
• Title I Annual Meeting
• Business Partnerships

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

Stakeholders:
Administration
Teachers
Staff
Parents
Students
Volunteers

All Stakeholders work together using the Parent Family Engagement Plan, Positive Behavior Intervention Support Plan, and the Cracker Trail's mission and vision to promote a positive culture and environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**