Crestwood Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Crestwood Elementary School

7824 N MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Diane Sanchez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
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 Hillsborough 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.](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

Crestwood Elementary School

7824 N MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[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	84%

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		B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

We will empower all students to become creative thinkers and respectful, responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Strive for P.R.I.D.E.

P- Positive
R- Respectful
I- Innovative
D-Driven
E-Engaged

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
Sanchez, Diane	Principal	The Principal directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of the school site. The Principal demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards.
Belliamy, Pat	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, Elementary, will assist with the instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of an elementary school.
Shane , Jessica	Instructional Coach	The Resource Teacher, District, Elementary Writing, will provide assistance in the oversight and daily operation of elementary writing education programs in K-5 classrooms by working with teachers, students, and administrators across the district.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/29/2021, Diane Sanchez

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.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

746

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

9

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

10

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	108	118	131	126	121	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	744
Attendance below 90 percent	2	36	38	41	22	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
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	9	33	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	41	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	22	67	54	46	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	280

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	1	1	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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

Tuesday 8/31/2021

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	115	130	124	127	161	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	783
Attendance below 90 percent	35	29	25	30	38	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	19	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	2	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	115	130	124	127	161	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	783
Attendance below 90 percent	35	29	25	30	38	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	19	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	2	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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				50%	52%	57%	44%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	55%	58%	54%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	50%	53%	54%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				50%	54%	63%	48%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	57%	62%	56%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	46%	51%	45%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				47%	50%	53%	41%	51%	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	45%	52%	-7%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	62%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	57%	-6%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	44%	51%	-7%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grades 1-5 used IReady for progress monitoring data. Grade 5 for Science used the science baseline, midyear, and end of year.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%	30%	48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0%	19%	24%
	English Language Learners	11%	24%	43%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11%	24%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	13%	6%	41%
	English Language Learners	8%	21%	38%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	41%	57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	7%	14%	14%
	English Language Learners	13%	31%	49%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14%	31%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	14%	14%	14%
	English Language Learners	13%	24%	51%

Grade 3			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38%	49%	60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	11%	22%	26%
	English Language Learners	18%	32%	42%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7%	22%	38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	7%	15%	19%
	English Language Learners	2%	16%	30%

Grade 4			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	35%	31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	8%	12%	12%
	English Language Learners	9%	21%	14%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14%	20%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	15%	16%	31%
	English Language Learners	10%	9%	26%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26%	37%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	10%	22%	26%
	English Language Learners	10%	23%	32%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15%	30%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	5%	13%	30%
	English Language Learners	5%	15%	26%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47.1%	12.7%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	22.&%	12.5%	19%
	English Language Learners	31.4%	5%	22.9%

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	24	64	77	29	56	57	28				
ELL	41	64	71	43	56	46	37				
BLK	26			16							
HSP	45	69	74	44	58	56	45				
MUL	80			60							
WHT	73			59							
FRL	46	68	71	44	56	54	42				
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	19	48	49	23	54	46	18				
ELL	44	63	67	50	65	59	49				
ASN	80	92		80	100						

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
BLK	43	63		29	37						
HSP	48	62	64	50	61	54	47				
MUL	55			64							
WHT	68	83		50	58						
FRL	48	63	63	49	61	53	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	19	31	35	29	41	24	30				
ELL	37	54	60	46	59	46	5				
ASN	65	77		90	92		60				
BLK	46	42		33	42						
HSP	42	54	55	47	55	43	36				
WHT	46	59		46	59						
FRL	43	53	54	47	56	43	41				

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	21
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	57
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	70
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	66
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	56
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?

Our English language learners and our students with disabilities need the most support amongst all grade levels.

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

Third grade math, Fourth grade ELA, and 5th grade Science show the greatest need for improvement.

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

Some students were not receiving the support they needed while they were either remote learning or quarantined last year. Attendance came into play as well. Having a clear plan amongst the grade levels of what students and parents can do if their child is quarantined will be beneficial. The ELA coaches will be assisting 4th grade. The district math and science coaches have been reached out to and will be assisting this year.

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

5th grade FSA reading and math showed the greatest improvement based on the state assessments.

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

Purposeful planning amongst the grade level as well as utilizing the district math and science coaches and the school's ELA coaches. ELA coaches were able to pull small groups working with targeted students.

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

Teachers will need to implement purposeful small group planning with grade level materials. Teachers will also need to be looking at their data and formally/informally assessing their students to make flexible small groups.

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.

Small group purposeful planning by ELA coaches

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

Accountability implementation for teachers through the use of IREADY and informal assesments.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	All teachers are planning in weekly planning sessions and PLCs focusing on intentional small group instruction. Students are actively engaged in intentional and DEEP differentiated small groups on a regular basis. Teachers were planning for content area on a weekly basis, yet had difficulty planning for small groups consistently due to lack of time and support.
Measurable Outcome:	8% of students will decrease from tier 3 (two or more grade levels below and tier 2 (one grade level below) on iReady diagnostic 3 (Spring) on the school summary report in Spring 2022.
Monitoring:	Administration, Coaches and Team leads will monitor teacher weekly planning sessions weekly. Administration, Coaches and Team leads will monitor small group planning with acceleration weekly. ALD's will; be used on a regular basis for all 3-5th grade teachers which will be monitored by the coaches. Goal setting is happening with every student in math and reading, this is monitored by teachers through the use of a data tracker.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers and coaches will utilize i-Ready Tools for instruction for below grade level. Teachers and coaches will utilize prerequisite i-Ready Lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers and students have access to the i-Ready tool box which contains the differentiationed lessons that provide scaffold for teachers to put into place. Teachers will also utilize the prereuwisite lessons from i-Ready to allow students to gain insight and review previously taught concepts prior to the lessons. This will help with acceleration as well.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly planning times established in all grade level by content. One planning day and time a week for ELA or Math/Science 3rd-5th. K-2 have intentional planning times on two days a week. One for ELA and one day for Math/Science.

Person Responsible	Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

ALD's are used on a regular basis for all 3-5th grade teachers in planning and instruction in small groups.

Person Responsible	Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

Goal setting is established, meaningful, and measurable after all i-Ready diagnostics with every stduent including students with disabilities.

Person Responsible	Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

Teachers are held accountable to pull i-Ready reports, in reading and math, looking at lessons passed versus not passed, usage, and time on task daily.

Person Responsible	Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

Classroom teachers are working with the ESE teachers weekly to communicate the standards they are teaching and how the ESE teacher can incorporate the grade level standards into small group instruction to meet the IEP goals.

Person Responsible Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students are working on intentional appropriately rigorous grade level content and learning activities with aggressive monitoring techniques that are completely aligned to standards. Third and fourth grade teachers need to focus on acceleration instead of remediation like they have in the past.
Measurable Outcome:	The third and fourth grade percentage of students scoring a level 3 and above will increase by 5% from the 2021 to the 2022 FSA assessment in reading and math.
Monitoring:	Through data chats and on going monitoring through i-Ready diagnostics, i-Ready growth monitoring, math monthlies, and the reading and writing prerequisite and midyear, teachers and coaches will monitor students progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers and coaches will utilize i-Ready Tools for instruction for and scaffolded on grade level Achieve lessons will be utilized.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through acceleration students will be exposed to on grade level Achieve articles. Teachers and coaches will provide various learning techniques to offer an array of teaching styles.

Action Steps to Implement

Ensuring the focus of grade level small group planning is aligned to the standards.

Person Responsible	Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

ALD's are used on a regular basis for all 3rd-5th grade teachers with sample questions for students.

Person Responsible	Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

Established, meaningful, and measurable goal setting is happening after optional and required assessments in all ELA and Math classrooms, with accountability from students using their data charts.

Person Responsible	Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

Data chats are occurring quarterly with ELA coaches. Students with disabilities are being tracked as well to ensure gains in proficiency as well as meeting the needs of their IEP.

Person Responsible	Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

Data driven PLC's to analyze data as well as monthly vertical PLC's occur focusing on grade level assignments and acceleration.

Person Responsible	Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

All k-5 teachers will goal set with the principal focusing on increasing their student's percentage of proficiency in either i-Ready or FSA in September, January, and May.

Person Responsible	Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2021 ELA FSA Scores, 38% in grade 4 and 44% in grade 3, scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. This score was due to learning loss from a world wide pandemic. By focusing on ELA, the instructional improvements will include higher order questioning and data analysis resulting in an improvement in student proficiency on the 2022 ELA FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of fourth grade students scoring at proficiency will increase to 43% as measured by the ELA FSA 2022 assessment. The percent of third grade students scoring at proficiency will increase 49% as measured by the ELA FSA 2022 assessment.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored through i-Ready growth checks, third and fourth grade monthly PMA's, informal and formal observations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase the effectiveness of higher order questioning. Implement a data analysis protocol during planning and/or data chats.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By increasing the effectiveness of higher order questioning will lead to productive student conversation and provides a window into student misconceptions and understandings. By implementing a data analysis protocol, this will ensure opportunities for teachers and student ownership of the data. In addition, the data analysis protocol will ensure teachers make instructional decision in planning based on both formal and informal data.

Action Steps to Implement

Higher order questioning:
Introduce teachers to Webb's Depths of Knowledge in their weekly planning session. Review the verbs and tasks.
Add to the planning framework for teachers to come to the weekly planning sessions with suggested higher order discussion questions and collaborative structures will be utilized.
Data Analysis Protocol:
Identify the bottom quartile students in third through fifth grade and develop a plan to track the identified student's progress in teacher and student data chats. Regularly share data with school-based leadership. Adjust support plans based on on-going data collection. Monitor student's progress through walkthroughs and analysis of student work.
Conduct initial data chats with teachers in third through fifth grade utilizing the district's data analysis protocol.
Conduct student data chats with third through fifth grade students. Review previous FSA data, i-Ready, performance tasks, and culminating experience tasks.

Person Responsible	Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

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.

Crestwood is ranked 745 out of 1,395 in the state of Florida Crestwood reported 0.6 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the statewide elementary rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. Property, drug and public order incidents was very low in rank in comparison to the state. However, violent incidents were ranked high when compared to the district. Our MTSS resource teacher has created a check in and check out system with the student, himself and the teachers. The social services team created a living document that identifies students who have a violent history and have put supports in place for students and teachers.

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.

We are a PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention System) school. We also do social, emotional learning lessons through the 7 Mindsets curriculum monthly in grades K-5. Crestwood is in constant contact with parents through Remind, the school website, parent links, and social media. Roaring with pride signifies a student per grade level weekly that the teacher chooses. We have business partners in the community that support our students and staff such as McDonald's and Chick Fil A.

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

The school builds positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders in many ways. Such as family nights, conference night, informational sessions about FSA, iReady, and grade levels, parent links, newsletter, business partnerships as volunteers.
Diane Sanchez is the principal: liaison between community resources, parents, and staff.
Patricia Belliamy is the assistant principal: serves as support for follow through of decisions and communication between stakeholders.
Coai Cruz is the guidance counselor: the parent involvement liaison
Anais Rodriguez is the guidance counselor: head of PBIS culture within the school

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00