

Broward County Public Schools

Cresthaven Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Cresthaven Elementary School

801 NE 25TH ST, Pompano Beach, FL 33064

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Donald Lee

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Cresthaven Elementary School

801 NE 25TH ST, Pompano Beach, FL 33064

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	83%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	94%

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 Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lee, Donald	Principal	As principal, Mr. Lee, provides the direction the leadership team takes to ensure student achievement.
Heavner, Jan	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Heavner supports the vision and direction of the principal to foster a safe and effective learning environment.
Addeo, Jamie	Reading Coach	Mrs. Addeo provides teachers with effective teaching strategies and gives support to improve their practice.
Borge, Karen	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Borge provides support to the school to ensure that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance.
Dektor, Brian	School Counselor	Mr. Dektor supports students' academic and social emotional growth.
O'Connor, Linda	Math Coach	Mrs. O'Connor supports teachers to improve instructional practice in teaching math.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Donald Lee

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.*

2

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

510

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

6

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

5

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	72	73	66	94	75	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
Attendance below 90 percent	22	24	20	22	29	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	19	27	16	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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	3	12	14	7	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	3	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/10/2021

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	67	69	67	88	69	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	444
Attendance below 90 percent	3	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	39	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	31	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	4	13	8	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	67	69	67	88	69	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	444
Attendance below 90 percent	3	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	39	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	31	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	4	13	8	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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				44%	59%	57%	45%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	60%	58%	55%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	54%	53%	58%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	65%	63%	44%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	66%	62%	42%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	53%	51%	29%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				37%	46%	53%	35%	49%	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	31%	60%	-29%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	62%	-16%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	59%	-24%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	52%	65%	-13%	62%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	67%	-19%	64%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	64%	-20%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	36%	49%	-13%	53%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready data was used to progress monitor.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17/25.8%	17/25.0%	31/44.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/25.9%	14/23.7%	26/44.1%
	Students With Disabilities	2/18.2%	0	3/27.3%
	English Language Learners	3/13.6%	4/18.2%	7/31.8%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15/23.1%	17/25.0%	23/33.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/21.1%	14/23.7%	19/32.2%
	Students With Disabilities	0	1/9.1%	2/18.2%
	English Language Learners	6/28.6%	4/18.2%	4/18.2%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	7/11.3%	13/21.3%	19/33.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/9.4%	13/24.5%	15/30.6%
	Students With Disabilities	2/18.2%	0	2/20.0%
	English Language Learners	2/8.3%	2/8.3%	5/22.7%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3/4.9%	4/6.6%	6/10.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/3.8%	3/5.8%	4/8.3%
	Students With Disabilities	1/10.0%	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	3/13.6%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21/25.6%	24/28.6%	34/38.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/29.0%	21/30.0%	28/37.8%
	Students With Disabilities	2/9.1%	1/4.5%	1/4.2%
	English Language Learners	4/9.8%	8/19.0%	13/29.5%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/7.3%	11/13.4%	23/27.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/7.2%	9/13.2%	18/25.4%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	1/4.2%
	English Language Learners	1/2.4%	3/7.3%	9/20.9%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25/35.2%	22/31.9%	7/30.4%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/32.3%	16/26.2%	7/31.8%
	Students With Disabilities	2/12.5%	3/21.4%	3/50.0%
	English Language Learners	1/5.3%	4/21.1%	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12/17.1%	18/25.7%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/11.5%	13/21.0%	0
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.3%	1/6.7%	0
	English Language Learners	1/5.3%	4/21.1%	0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12/15.0%	16/19.8%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/15.9%	15/21.4%	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	1/2.9%	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10/12.5%	15/18.8%	1/100%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/13.0%	13/18.8%	0
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.8%	2/9.1%	0
	English Language Learners	3/8.8%	6/18.2%	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			9.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			11.6
	Students With Disabilities			5.0
	English Language Learners			0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	9	39	55	9	24	18					
ELL	27	49	62	29	23	13	13				
BLK	29	57	58	28	24	27	15				
HSP	36	41		31	18		21				
FRL	32	52	65	28	22	12	21				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	38	31	21	40	38	17				
ELL	40	55	48	48	57	39	33				
BLK	37	46	44	55	68	58	32				
HSP	42	50	53	46	55	44	33				
WHT	82	69		82	85						

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
FRL	44	52	50	53	63	50	35				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	10	46	47	16	35	29	10				
ELL	38	62	65	40	38	29					
BLK	46	56	39	37	32	12	33				
HSP	40	55	75	48	40	33	37				
WHT	58	60		46	73						
FRL	43	52	56	43	43	32	32				

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	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	275
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	31
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

All students in grades 1-5, improved in both iReady Reading and Math progress monitoring from the fall 2020 check to the spring 2021 check.

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

Fall progress monitoring in iReady was substantially below in Reading and math in grades, 3,4,and 5 just as 2019 FSA demonstrated. The iReady Spring progress monitoring data indicated that our 3rd graders and the students with disabilities sub group (2019 FSA) were below 41% proficiency in ELA/ Reading.

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

Many students engaged in virtual learning during 2020-21 school year causing some loss of learning. However, Spring iReady data showed improvement since the fall diagnosis as at least 75% of students returned to Face to Face learning.

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

Economically disadvantaged students showed the most improvement in both ELA and Math according to the progress monitoring data from fall to 2020 to spring 2021..

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

When students returned face to face in early 2021, the iReady tests were closely monitored by teachers who used the data to plan accelerated lessons to decrease the gap in learning. In PLCs teachers analyzed the data to plan small group instruction.

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

This year, implementation of Tier 1 instruction through the new Benchmark Advance series will provide for the transfer of knowledge, authentic tasks, address unfinished learning, and provide interventions for students with significant learning deficiencies in reading.

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.

The professional learning communities (PLCs) will focus on aligning state standards and data to the new high quality Tier 1 Benchmark Advance instruction. The literacy coach will provide support to new teachers as well as to veterans as needed.

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

Early learning in K-3 will focus on foundational skills to target phonics and phonemic awareness through the implementation of programs such as Heggerty and Horizons to provide a smooth transition to comprehension. Grades K-5 will be provided Reading and Math camps to address unfinished learning necessary to understanding grade level expectations.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus will be to increase reading comprehension proficiency. There was a 15 point drop in ELA proficiency from 2018 to 2019 in grade 3. Progress monitoring data in 2020-21 indicated that ELA proficiency was still low at less than 38%.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, 3rd grade students will increase ELA proficiency to at least 38% as measured by the 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Students will be monitored through bi weekly assessments as part of the assessment protocols of the Benchmark Advance reading series. The assessments are given to measure progress of mastery of reading standards. Quarterly student reviews (data chats) and classroom walkthroughs will be conducted to discuss and observe individual students goals and progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Donald Lee (donald.lee@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Support Staff and teachers will fill in the foundational gaps in reading through early identification of students performing below level on the Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) and then provide evidence based interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Many students in grade 3 require additional supports as evidenced by assessments measuring reading standards mastery. Students with significant reading deficiencies will be provided tiered intervention supports to narrow the achievement gap.

Action Steps to Implement

Based on Multi-tiered systems of support, the Collaborative Problem solving Team (CPST) will identify and determine the level of support needed.

Person Responsible Donald Lee (donald.lee@browardschools.com)

3rd Grade students will be provided an intervention such as Leveled Literacy Intervention or the Benchmark Advance intervention.

Person Responsible Jamie Addeo (jamieaddeo@browardschools.com)

Support staff, CPST, and administration will monitor student progress to determine next steps or level of support.

Person Responsible Donald Lee (donald.lee@browardschools.com)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Proficiency in both math and ELA for students with disabilities indicated two consecutive years of proficiency below 32%. The lowest quartile students with disabilities dropped 16 points from the previous year. The progress monitoring data indicated by iReady diagnostic tests, show that students with disabilities are still below 10% proficiency, though 4th grade Spring iReady data indicated improvement by more than 30 points in reading.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, students with disabilities will increase proficiency and learning gains in math and ELA by at least 5 points as measured by FSA 2022.

Monitoring: Student data will be closely monitored every two weeks to ensure that mastery and acceleration is occurring. If there is unfinished learning, the students will revisit those standards as related to their IEP goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Donald Lee (donald.lee@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students with disabilities will be given differentiated instruction in both ELA and math. The classroom teachers will provide hands-on, explicit instruction to the student within a small group assuring that accommodations as indicated by the IEP is adhered to. Student progress will be monitored through grade level formative assessments. A n evidence-based math program, Acaletics will be used to provide a spiraling curriculum of standards. Guided reading at each student's instructional reading level will be conducted daily. AAn ESE support facilitator will also provide strategies to the student to acheive goals on the IEP.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students with disabilities (SWDs) will be provided differentiated instruction targeted to their special needs and IEP goals by both the classroom teacher and the ESE support facilitator. Frequent exposure to grade level math skills using Acaletics will ensure that students often revisit required skills

Action Steps to Implement

Classroom teachers will meet with support coaches to improve practice in Acaletics and guided reading. On-going professional development will be provided as needed.

Person Responsible Donald Lee (donald.lee@browardschools.com)

Teachers will provide rigorous instruction aligned to the ELA and math standards, while also meeting individual needs through explicit small group lessons aligned with IEP goals.

Person Responsible Donald Lee (donald.lee@browardschools.com)

Support staff and administration will meet with classroom teachers and support facilitators in student reviews (data chats) to monitor student progress. Progress will be monitored through the use of BAS, standards based assessments, and Acaletics scrimmages.

Person Responsible Donald Lee (donald.lee@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Cresthaven Elementary School's incident ranking is very low. Cresthaven ranked #38 of 116 elementary schools in the count and 268 out of 1395 schools in the state. Primary area of concern was disruption on campus with only one incident. Teachers have been trained in CHAMPS strategies to be proactive with student behavior.

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.

Cresthaven Elementary builds relationships with parents, students, and staff by utilizing strategies highlighted in the school's Social-Emotional learning (SEL) plan. The school counselor conducts small group discussion among students with specific needs. School-wide events for staff and for the community are planned each year to strengthen ties among its stakeholders.

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

Cresthaven develops the "whole child" in both cognitive and emotional domains. The School counselor, the School Advisory Council (SAC) and school advisory forum (SAF) as well as the PTA are all encouraged to get involved in the school's mission and vision. Community mentors are often paired with students needing guided support in making good choices. Title I funds are used to provide engaging activities that assist parents with strategies to help their students. The school support staff (includes coaches) design parent events such as Math night, Reading under the Stars, and ESOL family nights.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$8,306.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22

	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0901 - Cresthaven Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,805.00
			<i>Notes: Standards-based lessons for ELA through curriculum Assoc. Ready Teacher Toolbox</i>			
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0901 - Cresthaven Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$991.00
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0901 - Cresthaven Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$4,510.00
			<i>Notes: ELO Salary/stipends for academic camps in reading and math</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$20,451.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0901 - Cresthaven Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,295.00
			<i>Notes: Explore Learning- Reflex math- improve math computation skills.</i>			
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0901 - Cresthaven Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$2,395.00
			<i>Notes: Illuminate- School city assessments for ELA and Math</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0901 - Cresthaven Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$11,261.00
			<i>Notes: Acaletics Quick Picks spiral math curriculum grades 2-5.</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0901 - Cresthaven Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$3,500.00
			<i>Notes: Write Score for grades 4/5 to improve writing through classroom lessons.</i>			
					Total:	\$28,757.00