Martin County School District

Crystal Lake Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Crystal Lake Elementary School

2095 SW 96TH ST, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/cles

Demographics

Principal: Brenda Watkins

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (64%)
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 Martin 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

Crystal Lake Elementary School

2095 SW 96TH ST, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/cles

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	No	40%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

School Grades History

Year	**2020-21**	**2019-20**	**2018-19**	**2017-18**
Grade		A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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.

In partnership with families and the community, our mission is to equip students with the skills and knowledge necessary to become responsible and caring citizens through innovative learning experiences and collaborative social interactions.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to inspire students to think critically, learn creatively, and engage daily in positive community learning environments.

#GameOnCLE
#ShowYourPotential

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
Watkins, Brenda	Principal	Oversee the duties of running the school, staff evaluations, Instructional Leader
Parker, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, evaluate staff, discipline, fills in for principal as needed.
Hodowanic, Laira	School Counselor	MTSS, meets with teachers, parents and students as needed.
Francis, Michele	Other	Liaison between Gen Ed and ESE services.
Grauer, Crystal	Instructional Coach	District instructional Coach supports our school with teaching strategies, reading support and more.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2013, Brenda Watkins

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.*
4

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Total number of students enrolled at the school

445

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

2

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	59	70	75	81	65	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	445
Attendance below 90 percent	19	23	24	31	29	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/19/2021

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	70	69	66	62	95	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	11	11	8	7	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
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	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	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	78	77	74	66	103	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	500
Attendance below 90 percent	18	7	6	7	17	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	16	30	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	28	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	14	24	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	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				66%	58%	57%	61%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	59%	58%	62%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	56%	53%	51%	49%	48%
Math Achievement				69%	65%	63%	68%	66%	62%
Math Learning Gains				67%	65%	62%	58%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	53%	51%	43%	43%	47%
Science Achievement				66%	58%	53%	68%	59%	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	69%	54%	15%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	55%	13%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	69%	58%	11%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	67%	4%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	64%	0%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	65%	53%	12%	53%	12%
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: iReady
Science: District Progress Monitoring

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34.26	48.58	65.63
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.77	31.84	51.01
	Students With Disabilities	26.17	39.33	55.94
	English Language Learners	14.86	23.61	37.5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21.08	42.54	65.32
	Economically Disadvantaged	16.1	30.15	55.61
	Students With Disabilities	21.53	37.41	59.71
	English Language Learners	12.16	24.66	54.17

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37.29	49.72	64.74
	Economically Disadvantaged	22.38	29.29	47.06
	Students With Disabilities	34.62	45.45	58.59
	English Language Learners	15.79	21.62	28.95
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20.73	42.12	67.54
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.02	27.54	55.97
	Students With Disabilities	26.26	43.75	66.32
	English Language Learners	7.89	18.42	47.37

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47.31	53.82	64.69
	Economically Disadvantaged	29.71	34.56	49.24
	Students With Disabilities	56.1	57.98	67.23
	English Language Learners	14.29	16.67	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27.74	45.2	71.43
	Economically Disadvantaged	22.22	28.57	61.24
	Students With Disabilities	41.03	53.91	75.44
	English Language Learners	14.29	16.67	50

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48.89	50.57	60.55
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.97	30.48	41.58
	Students With Disabilities	57.69	57.73	68.32
	English Language Learners	15.63	16.13	18.75
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30.83	47.88	69.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	22.86	32.04	58.76
	Students With Disabilities	45	55.79	72.63
	English Language Learners	12.5	21.88	50

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43.68	47.06	52.97
	Economically Disadvantaged	24.69	30.86	32.5
	Students With Disabilities	50.79	50.82	58.06
	English Language Learners	16	24	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	33.69	48.65	67.96
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.25	32.5	56.41
	Students With Disabilities	48.33	55.93	67.24
	English Language Learners	20	28	64
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	42.42	55.67	42.42
	Economically Disadvantaged	30.23	45.24	30.23
	Students With Disabilities	46.15	59.09	46.15
	English Language Learners	6.67	33.33	6.67

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	34	27	27	27	7		9				
ELL	31	17		24	25		8				
HSP	50	46		39	35	40	40				
MUL				9							
WHT	63	56	27	59	34		67				
FRL	41	33	14	39	18	14	39				

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	47	58	44	52	66	54	50				
ELL	41	69		64	69						
BLK	54			46							
HSP	48	67	92	64	74		75				

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
MUL	36			57							
WHT	73	58	39	73	67	47	66				
FRL	52	64	68	54	58	48	45				

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	36	38	35	45	45	31	38				
ELL	21			43							
BLK	62			77							
HSP	54	65		65	61		63				
MUL	33			50							
WHT	64	59	47	70	58	42	71				
FRL	41	51	48	49	45	41	56				

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	345
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	24
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 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	41
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	9
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	51
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	29
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

In 2019 CLE FSA scores reflected: In 2021 CLE FSA scores reflected:

ELA Proficiency 66% (+5) ELA Proficiency 59% (-6)
Learning Gains 59% (-3) Learning Gains 52% (-7)
Lowest Quartile 55% (+2) Lowest Quartile 25% (-30)

Math Proficiency 69% (+1) Math Proficiency 52% (-17)
Learning Gains 67% (+9) Learning Gains 34% (-33)
Lowest Quartile 49% (+6) Lowest Quartile 23% (-26)

Science Proficiency 66% (-2) Science Proficiency 59% (-7)

2021 Grade Levels
ELA Proficiency LG LQ
3 63 - -
4 52 40 40 (2/5)
5 63 53 21 (4/19)
Math
3 50 - -
4 56 67 67 (4/6)
5 49 32 6 (1/16)

2019 Subgroups 2021 Subgroups
ELA Proficiency LG LQ ELA Proficiency LG LQ
ESE 47 58 25 ESE (50) 34 27 27 (11)
HSP 48 58 44 HSP (64) 50 46 22 (9)
ELL 41 69 ELL (29) 31 17 0
FRL 52 64 68 FRL (95) 41 33 14 (14)
Multi (9) 33 67 50 (2)

Math Math
ESE 52 66 54 ESE (52) 27 7 14 (7)
HSP 64 74 HSP (64) 39 35 40 (10)
ELL 64 69 ELL (29) 24 25 50 (4)
FRL 54 58 48 FRL (96) 39 18 14 (14)
Multi (11) 9 33 0

Science Science
ESE 50 ESE (11) 9
HSP 75 HSP (25) 40
ELL ELL (12) 8
FRL 45 FRL (36) 39

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

We saw an overall decrease in test scores. The largest decrease was in
ELA Lowest Quartile learning gains (-30 points to 25%)
Math Proficiency (-17 points to 52%)
Math Learning Gains (-33 points to 34%)
Math Lowest Quartile learning gains (-26 points to 23%)

Decrease in 5th grade ELA and Math learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains make a large portion of learning gain points lost. 5th grade cohort ELA proficiency scores for 2019 was 69. (This group dropped 6%.); Same group's math scores were 68%. There was a significant drop to 49%. Also, learning gains were 32% and only 1/16 students in the lowest quartile made a learning gain.
Grade 5
ELA: Prof: 63 LG: 53 LQ: 21 (4/19)
Math: Prof: 49 32 6 (1/16)

Grade 4 had the lowest ELA proficiency (40%).

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

Students lost maximum learning opportunities the last nine weeks of 2020. At the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year 35 - 40% of our students started remotely with our largest number of students in 4th and 5th grades. Even though students started returning back to in person instruction we noticed our 5th graders, EL's and Hispanic students stayed on remote longer, some into the second semester. It was hard to progress monitor students who were not in attendance regularly (in person or remote).

For the 2021-2022:
ELA: We have a new reading series that teachers are focusing on implementing. We will be meeting monthly with with Literacy Team to focus on implementing learning walks, sharing data with teachers to identify critical strategy areas for improvement. Additionally, we be inviting district instructional coaches and support from Title I/ELL Department for guidance.
Math: We are working with MCSD Math Department on learning walks, targeting engagement strategies for high yield results and also monitoring complexity level of lessons and materials being used.
Science: Last December our Science Lab teacher retired. We hired a substitute to finish the school year. This year we have a new science lab teacher who had been a 5th grade teacher. She is working with teachers on providing supplies for classroom science activities. She is implementing a school Science Fair to increase competition in the district science fair. This teacher is also working with students during WIN time.

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

Unfortunately, we saw a drop on all FSA scores with the exception of our Hispanic subgroup proficiency that increased 2%. However, using iReady scores we did see steady increase in progress monitoring scores for grades 1-5 with the except of ELL students in 5th grade whose ELA and math scores dropped at the end of the year.

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

We have a staff who is student focused and experienced in using data to make instructional decisions. Teachers who performed the best had relationships with students and their parents to work together as a team. We worked very hard to get students off of remote learning and into classrooms. This was more difficult in some classrooms where teachers were spending more time addressing remote students instead of the students in person. We encouraged them/ gave them permission to focus on the students in front of them more and how to still provide instruction for students at home. We supported teachers with strategies, trainings and administrative support.

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

We are implementing additional support in classrooms. By combining 4th and 5th grade related arts classes we had additional time to use related arts teachers in classrooms to support 4th grade level 1's and 2's. Additionally, not all related arts teachers have classes everyday. On those days, they push in to provide more help in the support facilitation gen ed classes. Also, using a priority list of EL students (providing by the district ESOL support coordinator, the EL para's schedule has been revised to give more support to the students, who have been in the program the longest and not making adequate progress using WIDA scores.

We have a new science lab teacher who was a 5th grade teacher in previous years. She has already started implementing activities previously eliminated (i.e. Science Fair). In addition, she has been able to work with a list of 5th grade students identified by 5th grade teachers using Science PMT data from Spring 2021. These are students not involved in MTSS groupings.

Last, we have a list of teachers interested in tutoring after school and will work with them identifying students and structure.

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.

We are a cluster site for fulltime gifted students in grades 3-5. These teachers provide enrichment opportunities during WIN (What I Need) time to explore activities in technology, guitar/keyboard, and other projects. We have a teacher who already started a Robotics Club after school for 4th and 5th grade students (some gifted/ some by interest). Using instructional coaches we work with teachers on how to provide more advanced learning for students in their classrooms during regular instruction and WIN. This may include teachers sharing groups of students in same grade levels during WIN time so that students can participate in advanced lessons.

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

The intent is that we can continue moving forward with in person learning and being able to keep students in school (not quarantined). By providing continuity in learning there will be less interruption and smoother transitions from lesson to lesson. Due to retirements and resignations, we have newer teachers needing training that was implemented several years ago (i.e. Math, Student Engagement, Differentiated Instruction.)

We have used district instructional coaches to help provide support for new and struggling teachers. By monitoring lessons and assessment results during the school year and at the end of the year, we ensure that we have teachers in the correct placement (grade levels and departmentalizing). We also need to continue working with teachers on building relationships with students to help with discipline thus keeping students in the classroom.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2019 CLE FSA scores reflected: In 2021 CLE FSA scores reflected: Math Proficiency 69% (+1) Math Proficiency 52% (-17) Learning Gains 67% (+9) Learning Gains 34% (-33) Lowest Quartile 49% (+6) Lowest Quartile 23% (-26) 2021 Grade Levels Math Proficiency LG LQ 3 50 - - 4 56 67 67 (4/6) 5 49 32 6 (1/16) 2019 Subgroups 2021 Subgroups Math Math ESE 52 66 54 ESE (52) 27 7 14 (7) HSP 64 74 HSP (64) 39 35 40 (10) ELL 64 69 ELL (29) 24 25 50 (4) FRL 54 58 48 FRL (96) 39 18 14 (14) Multi (11) 9 33 0 52% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient on the 2021 administration of the Math FSA. This was a 17 % drop from 2019. We need to increase our learning gains for our lowest quartile and all our subgroups. iReady domain Numbers and Operations shows a need for improvement across all grade levels. Fact fluency, in all operations needs to be mastered in each grade level. Lesson plans will reflect an increase in Number Talks at least three times per week. By strengthening our core and providing small group differentiation, our learning gains, proficiency, and lowest quartile will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	Grades 3-5: 74% of students will score at level 3 or higher on the 2022 administration of the Math Florida Standards Assessment. We want to also increase math achievement for our ESE and ELL students. Grades K -2: 75% of the students will be on grade level by the end of the school year using end of the year iReady Diagnostic. Using the FSA Math scores from 2019 including focusing on increasing proficiency in all subgroups to 2019 numbers + 5%: Grade 3 proficiency will increase 5% to 74%, Grade 4 proficiency will increase 5% to 76% Grade 5 proficiency will increase 5% to 69% Math: Learning Gains will increase 5% to 72% including focusing on increasing proficiency in all subgroups to 2019 numbers + 5%: Lowest Quartile will increase 5% to 54%, including focusing on increasing proficiency in all subgroups to 2019 numbers + 5%:
Monitoring:	iReady data will be reviewed at each diagnostic, iReady standards mastery (ism), and growth monitoring assessments to monitor growth and proficiency in grades K-5. Data will be used to confirm/reevaluate effectiveness of lessons and small group instruction at weekly PLC's and leadership admin meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	District math coach will work with teachers on standards based instruction, Number Talks, and small goup differentiation. District Math coach will also work one on one with teachers on monitoring for active student engagement and fluency around the use of Number Talks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Pulling small groups to differentiate instruction for those students who have learning gaps is going to be essential this year. It is important for teachers to understand the complexity level of the standards, design engaging activities, and also monitor to make sure students are reaching the desired effect.

Action Steps to Implement

Continue with departmentalizing in grades 3-5 as long as our data supports it (teachers were selected based on iReady and FSA data).

Person Responsible Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.k12.fl.us)

Admin will meet with teachers to identify subgroups and their lowest quartile students.

Person Responsible Brenda Watkins (watkinb@martin.k12.fl.us)

Admin and District Math Coach will continue to support grade level PLC's

Person Responsible Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.k12.fl.us)

District math Coach will continue focusing on teachers in grades 3-5 (observing, modeling Number Talks, help teachers to plan for small groups, and provide follow up strategies while monitoring for fidelity). Targeted planning for differentiation at the levels 2, 3, and 4 using the CRA model. Continue looking at data using summative/formative assessments to monitor student progress and help teachers create small groups to differentiate lessons. Also, provide manipulatives to support more concrete representation.

Person Responsible Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.k12.fl.us)

Grades K-2 are continuing with implementing Number Talks. The district math coach will support the teachers in grades 3-5 who teach math and will model Number Talks lessons and will refer to strategies in the Number Talks book to implement in the classroom. Also, provide manipulatives to support more concrete representation.

Person Responsible Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.k12.fl.us)

District Math Coach will work with teachers on evidence based strategies and small group differentiated instruction. District math coach and Assistant Principal will look at data using summative and common formative assessments to monitor student progress and to help teachers plan for differentiated lessons and interventions.

Person Responsible Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.k12.fl.us)

Provide double blocks of time to review MTSS data and student progress to determine the continued level of support.

Person Responsible Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.k12.fl.us)

Learning Walks for Math with vertical grade levels so that teachers can see other good teaching strategies, ask questions, get clarifications, celebrate success and identify areas of need.

Person Responsible Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.k12.fl.us)

After school tutoring by teachers with direct targeted instruction (i.e. iReady, Teacher Toolbox). Also, provide open iReady lesson support for students in the computer lab before and after school.

Person Responsible Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	56% of students in 5th grade were proficient on the 2021 administration of the Science end of year assessment. This was a 9% drop from 2019. The area of focus is to increase proficiency within all of our subgroups by 5%: 2019 Subgroups 2021 Subgroups Science Science ESE 50 ESE (11) 9 HSP 75 HSP (25) 40 ELL ELL (12) 8 FRL 45 FRL (36) 39
Measurable Outcome:	In 2019 CLE FSA scores reflected: In 2021 CLE FSA scores reflected: Science Proficiency 65% (-2) Science Proficiency 56% (-9) Increase Science proficiency from a 56% to 71%. Continue focusing on all sub groups by differentiating instruction.
Monitoring:	The district provides Science progress monitoring assessments (PMT's) through Performance Matters for grades 3-5 that provides data on how students are progressing with the science standards. These tests take place three times a year and are used to determine which students need remediation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement differentiation strategies to help all students with comprehension and mastering the science standards. Continue to use District Science Coordinator to help with curriculum resources and to ensure that lessons are aligned with the Florida Standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Too many times we target lower subgroups to help with proficiency and forget about the more successful groupings. By differentiating instruction for all students, we can make sure we are addressing the needs of all students and not just specific subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement	
Continue with departmentalizing in grades 3-5 (teachers were selected based on Benchmark and FSA data)	
Person Responsible	Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.k12.fl.us)
Choice and Voice for 4th and 5th grades - Science option gives students in grades 4-5 more consecutive days to go deeper into science standards. All 5th graders will have to choose Science Voice and Choice at least once throughout the school year.	
Person Responsible	Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.k12.fl.us)
5th Grade teachers will review and modify instruction based on summative and formative assessments (including Science PMT's).	
Person Responsible	Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.k12.fl.us)

Science Lab teacher is pushing in to 5th grade during WIN to work with 20 students who were identified as needing remediation based off of the last Science PMT they took. These students are not in a tier 2 or tier 3 ELA intervention but need extra support in Science. This group has the flexibility to change after each PMT is given.

Person Responsible Elaine Sanchez (sanchee@martin.k12.fl.us)

All 4th and 5th grade students in voice and choice will be completing a science fair project this year that will go to the District STEM Fair that happens in May. Nature of Science is an area our students often score low in. There will also be a CLE Science Fair (in April) that all students can participate in. Volunteer judges will offer feedback and rate the projects based on a rubric. Teaming with PTA, CLE will have their own awards ceremony and those students will be highly encouraged to enter theirs in the District STEM Fair. After school science fair workshops will be offered twice a month starting in November for 4th and 5th grade voice and choice students. There will also be a meeting held at the school for parents who want to know more about how to help their child do a Science Fair project.

Person Responsible Elaine Sanchez (sanchee@martin.k12.fl.us)

More hands on exposure to science experiments on Early Release Days (Egg drop, Catapult, Energy). Intermediate grade levels can pair up with primary grade levels to help do/teach hands on experiments. The science lab and equipment is available to classroom teachers. The Science lab can be used during Mrs. Sanchez's planning and lunch time. The science lab equipment can be checked out at anytime.

Person Responsible Elaine Sanchez (sanchee@martin.k12.fl.us)

After school clubs will be offered such as the Green Team (recycling programs, water conservation, and gardening club). The gardening club will focus on restoring the many pollinator gardens on our campus.

Person Responsible Elaine Sanchez (sanchee@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2021 FSA ELA scores dropped in all areas including subgroups. In 2019 CLE FSA scores reflected: ELA Proficiency 66% (+5) Learning Gains 59% (-3) Lowest Quartile 55% (+2) In 2021 CLE FSA scores reflected: ELA Proficiency 59% (-6) Learning Gains 52% (-7) Lowest Quartile 25% (-30) 2021 Grade Levels ELA Proficiency LG LQ 3 63 - - 4 52 40 40 (2/5) 5 63 53 21 (4/19) Math 3 50 - - 4 56 67 67 (4/6) 5 49 32 6 (1/16) 2019 Subgroups 2021 Subgroups ELA Proficiency LG LQ ELA Proficiency LG LQ ESE 47 58 25 ESE (50) 34 27 27 (11) HSP 48 58 44 HSP (64) 50 46 22 (9) ELL 41 69 ELL (29) 31 17 0 FRL 52 64 68 FRL (95) 41 33 14 (14) Multi (9) 33 67 50 (2)
Measurable Outcome:	Grades K -2: 80% of the students will be on grade level by the end of the school year using end of the year assessments from Benchmark. Using the FSA ELA scores from 2019 including focusing on increasing proficiency in all subgroups to 2019 numbers + 5%: Grade 3 proficiency will increase 5% to 74%, Grade 4 proficiency will increase 5% to 63% Grade 5 proficiency will increase 5% to 73% ELA: Learning Gains will increase 5% to 64%including focusing on increasing proficiency in all subgroups to 2019 numbers + 5%: Lowest Quartile will increase 5% to 60%, including focusing on increasing proficiency in all subgroups to 2019 numbers + 5%:
Monitoring:	January 2022 Benchmark Diagnostic assessment data will be compared to fall. In between Benchmark Advanced Unit assessments will be reviewed and monitored making sure struggling students needs are being addressed through interventions. In addition: January APM results will be analyzed with grade levels to identify areas to focus on before the FSA

later in the year. These results will be reviewed and shared with grade levels during faculty meetings and/or PLC's. Also, use this data to determine additional instructional needs through differentiating, remedial and interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brenda Watkins (watkinb@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use high effect strategies (differentiating instruction, white boards, turn and talks, student feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Benchmark Advance: Students learn by talking about content. Teachers can gather information and/or guide students in orally responded. White boards used for providing answers provide instant comprehension checks. Last providing immediate feedback will provide students with confirmation and/or the need to ask additional questions. Teachers will also be able to use their observations during the lesson to pull students for differentiating instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Leadership Team - To meet (2 times a month) to analyze data, concerns, and needs to support teachers. Also, to help provide focus for Literacy Leadership Team.
Literacy Leadership Team - To meet (1-2 times a month)and provide additional support to teachers while implementing the new reading series.

Person Responsible	Brenda Watkins (watkinb@martin.k12.fl.us)

Attend PLC's/MTSS meetings monitoring data - Grades K, 2, 4 - Brenda Watkins, Principal
Grades 1, 3, 5 - Jennifer Parker, Assistant Principal
Work with instructional coach to provide trainings for teachers on Lesson Plan Studies and Action Research to focus on during PLC meetings.

Person Responsible	Brenda Watkins (watkinb@martin.k12.fl.us)

Conduct walkthroughs through all classrooms at least 1-2 times a month. Record observations on form provided by District ELA Coordinator.

Person Responsible	Brenda Watkins (watkinb@martin.k12.fl.us)

Schedule Learning Walks so all teachers can participate. Use information collected to identify common strengths and areas to work on.

Person Responsible	Brenda Watkins (watkinb@martin.k12.fl.us)

Share spreadsheet with teachers in grades 4 and 5 which includes all students rank from lowest to highest. This will provide teachers with information on lowest quartile students. Additional tabs are added for ELL, ESE, Hispanic. This information will be used to monitor these students in subgroups.

Person Responsible	Brenda Watkins (watkinb@martin.k12.fl.us)

Support opportunities for teachers to learn teaching strategies using Benchmark and for high yield effect strategies.

Person Responsible	Brenda Watkins (watkinb@martin.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will attend MTSS meetings regularly (1-2 month) or more frequently as needed to address student needs. Students will be monitored for progress, lack or progress and next steps.

Person Responsible Laira Hodowanic (hodowal@martinschools.org)

Provide teachers with B.E.S.T. standards. Communicate and provide Benchmark Advanced training opportunities for teachers.

Person Responsible Brenda Watkins (watkinb@martin.k12.fl.us)

Provide tutoring options for students before and/or after school. Students groups will be based on need. Materials used may include (Benchmark, Fundations, LLI, or other options listed in the ELA Decision Tree.

Person Responsible Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.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.

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.

This school year started with the excitement that all students would be in school and remote would no longer be an option. Meeting the social and emotional needs for everyone (staff, students, and families) is a top priority. We will continue with programs implemented in previous years to address social and emotional needs of all our stakeholders.

Based on Satisfaction and Engagement Survey Teacher results: The lowest area of need was Q27: My Opinions Matter: SA 37.50%; A 33.33% ; D 20.83 (5) ; SD 8.33 (2).

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

Based on Q27: Principal and Assistant Principal will work to provide teachers with more opportunities to give input. The Principal will review the Spring 2021 Satisfaction and Engagement Survey results (Parent/ Students). Teachers will then be provided with the teacher survey and asked to work in groups to identify areas of needs and possible suggestions. We have a suggestion box that is used to provide topics for the Faculty Council to address during meetings (minimum 3 times/year). Possibly used additional surveys during the year to do quick checks on how we are doing.

Provide Clifton StrengthsFinder codes for teachers to take and then share results as grade level teams and whole group. This will help teachers better understand themselves and each other including admin.

Both administrators work together to provide opportunities to give staff positive notes recognizing them for various reasons. Also, administration works with school Sunshine and PTA to provide monthly treats based on a theme or sometimes "just because we appreciate you", "We want you to know how much we appreciate you." PBIS team will continue to come up with ideas on how to recognize staff (i.e.drawings, events, etc).

PBIS team has been working on Positive Behavior Support certificates and positive calls home when students go beyond the normal to provide help or support to a staff member or another student.

Part V: Budget

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$1,770.33**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	510-Supplies	0301 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$1,770.33
			Notes: To purchase Reknreks for kindergarten and manipulatives for grade levels as needed.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$2,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	510-Supplies	0301 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$2,000.00
			Notes: Provide remedial, intervention supplies.			
					Total:	**$3,770.33**