

Polk County Public Schools

Crystal Lake Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Crystal Lake Middle School

2410 CRYSTAL LAKE DR N, Lakeland, FL 33801

<http://www.polk-fl.net/clms>

Demographics

Principal: Sarah M IR Anda

Start Date for this Principal: 4/27/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (41%) 2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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 Polk 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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Crystal Lake Middle School

2410 CRYSTAL LAKE DR N, Lakeland, FL 33801

<http://www.polk-fl.net/clms>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide an atmosphere conducive to maximizing each student's individual academic potential and positive self-esteem with support from parents, community, and business partners to help ensure a positive and safe culture.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To foster a safe and supportive learning environment where students have opportunities to engage in rigorous instruction. Prepare students for the real-world by offering instruction that is challenging, collaborative and creative in order to encourage student ownership of their learning. We strive to meet our students' social and emotional needs to support our students in achieving academic success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cotter, Ronda	Principal	Instructional Leader, vision and mission, data, science and civics liaison,
Brown, Mekeisha	Assistant Principal	Scheduling, reading and ELA liaison, volunteer coordinator,
Morris, Sheritta	Reading Coach	Facilitator for reading and ELA, new teacher liaison, PEC coordinator
Cummings, Albert	Assistant Principal	Oversees discipline and math department. Leader of CSTAG team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 4/27/2015, Sarah M IR Anda

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

935

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

11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	284	297	350	0	0	0	0	931	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	154	200	0	0	0	0	479	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	149	148	151	0	0	0	0	448	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	155	160	0	0	0	0	436	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	168	141	0	0	0	0	435	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	24	34	0	0	0	0	97	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	0	0	173	199	210	0	0	0	0	582	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	5	0	0	0	0	5	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	5	0	0	0	0	18	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/29/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	29%	40%	50%				31%	48%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	39%						43%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%						41%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	30%	34%	36%				35%	50%	58%
Math Learning Gains	39%						44%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						46%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	40%	53%				28%	44%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	52%	49%	58%				54%	72%	72%

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
06	2022					
	2019	31%	48%	-17%	54%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	27%	42%	-15%	52%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
08	2022					
	2019	31%	48%	-17%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	28%	47%	-19%	55%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	28%	39%	-11%	54%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
08	2022					
	2019	21%	35%	-14%	46%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	27%	41%	-14%	48%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	54%	70%	-16%	71%	-17%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	89%	50%	39%	61%	28%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	94%	53%	41%	57%	37%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	9	24	24	11	23	29	13	27			
ELL	17	32	30	18	36	36	17	45	71		
ASN	50										
BLK	23	37	42	19	33	43	22	39	90		
HSP	27	38	33	27	41	36	27	50	73		
MUL	24	25		32	30						
WHT	37	43	29	42	39	45	41	66	69		
FRL	25	37	31	27	37	38	27	50	71		
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	7	15	9	7	18	17	6	31			
ELL	16	28	33	20	29	29	16	45			
BLK	16	25	18	22	33	31	28	49	75		
HSP	24	31	30	19	27	29	22	46	58		
MUL	39	43		26	33						
WHT	39	38	24	41	34	29	44	73	69		
FRL	24	30	23	26	31	30	29	55	60		
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	15	34	28	20	37	34	21	38			
ELL	17	44	49	22	37	39	29	50			
BLK	23	38	44	26	39	44	19	30	80		
HSP	29	43	44	35	47	45	26	57	93		
MUL	33	30		32	33			60			
WHT	38	45	37	39	44	48	36	64	83		
FRL	31	41	39	34	43	47	26	56	86		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	50
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	28
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	46
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 but one data components made improvements from the previous year according to state assessment (FSA) data:

- ELA proficiency increased 1%, gains went up 7%, BQ went up 9%.
- Math proficiency increased 2%, gains went up 8%, and BQ went up 10%
- Civics was the only area to show a decrease by 6 percentage points.
- Science proficiency was the same as the previous year.
- Our 6th graders had the highest percentage of proficiency in math and reading.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our civics component decreased 6 percentage points from 58% to 52%.

Reading BQ, although up 9 percentage points this year, is still lower than our 41% goal with 33% of our bottom quartile showing learning gains. If we continue to increase at that rate, our ELA should be able to meet or exceed our goal this year.

Science has remained steady over the last few years. Science is exactly 32% proficient on the last two FSA tests so we would like to see an increase in science proficiency.

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

71% of our students are performing below grade level on state reading assessments. Reading comprehension skills are needed on Civics and Science assessments. If we can work to improve our students reading comprehension and increase the percentage of proficiency on the Reading assessments, we should also be able to see an improvement to proficiency on the Civics and Science assessments as well.

Students in intensive reading classes will receive support through the Corrective Reading program. Reading interventionist will continue to provide push-in and pull-out support to students. We will also utilize the Learning Arc framework in PLC to make sure that benchmarks are clearly understood and taught to the state's intent.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math BQ increased 10 percentage points to 40% of students in the bottom quartile showing learning gains.

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

Our math department has been fully staffed and has remained mostly consistent over the last few years. We added one new math teacher this past year, however, most of our math department has been here at least 3 years. One of our math interventionists and testing coordinator provided push in support to our math classes throughout the school year.

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

Coaches and teachers will utilize the Learning Arc framework in PLCs to breakdown BEST standards and create standards-aligned objectives. Coaches will assist teachers in standard-task alignment to ensure benchmarks are being taught to the true intent.

Students in our BQ will receive remediation in a foundational skills math class using Math180 program.

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.

Teachers who will be implementing new curricula will be trained by school-based instructional coaches. Coaches and administrators will support teachers in PLC with the new Learning Arc framework and task-target alignment. Staff development days will be planned based on observation data and the needs of the school community.

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

Math, Reading, and Behavior Interventionists will continue to provide targeted support to our students identified as needing tier 2 or 3 support.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

As we begin to implement the new B.E.S.T Standards, our focus is to be intentional about delivering grade-level, standards-aligned instruction and tasks to our students. Our 2021-2022 FSA data shows that 29% of students are proficient in Reading and 30% of students are proficient in math. This means that at least 70% of our students are not performing on grade-level in math or reading. We will shift our focus to making sure our students are receiving tasks that are on grade-level and aligned to state standards so we can begin to see increased proficiency on benchmark assessments.

Measurable Outcome:
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase at least +2% of students proficient in reading and math on state benchmark assessments.

Monitoring:
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

- 1) We will use the district's walkthrough tool in order to measure tasks for alignment to BEST Standards.
- 2) Discuss walkthrough tool and progress monitoring data in weekly leadership meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ronda Cotter (ronda.cotter@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

- 1) Utilize the Learning Arc Framework to guide lesson planning and delivery
- 2) Use district's walkthrough tool to evaluate lessons and tasks for alignment and grade-level appropriateness

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
 Describe the

- Utilizing the Learning Arc Framework to guide lesson planning will:
- 1) deepen our understanding of state benchmarks
 - 2) ensure we have the information needed to produce benchmark-aligned lessons and tasks for our students

**resources/
criteria used for
selecting this
strategy.**

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- 1) Admin and coaching staff (Leadership Team) will be trained in the use of the district's walkthrough tool
 - a) Leadership team will conduct calibration walks
 - b) Walkthrough data will be discussed in weekly leadership meetings

Person Responsible Ronda Cotter (ronda.cotter@polk-fl.net)

Admin, coaches, and teachers will use tools such as rubrics; text complexity guide, etc, to evaluate tasks and objectives for grade-level appropriateness.

Person Responsible Ronda Cotter (ronda.cotter@polk-fl.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Discipline**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

During the 2021-2022 school year, we had a total of 1,981 office discipline referrals. Of those referrals, 418 incidents were for Abusive Language/Conduct-Others, our 2nd highest discipline code. 149 were for Abusive Language/Conduct-Staff. These negative interactions have had an effect on the culture and climate of the school community.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Decrease number of incidents coded ABU and ABE by 5%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

- 1) Discuss discipline data in weekly leadership meetings
- 2) Solicit feedback from students and staff regarding school culture

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ronda Cotter (ronda.cotter@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

- 1) Restorative Justice Practices- alternatives to OSS
- 2) Mentoring
- 3) Character Education Lessons
- 4) PBIS

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

There is much research that shows implementing either of the four strategies listed provide opportunities for students to learn healthier ways to express themselves. Research also shows that suspensions are ineffective and suggest implementing restorative justice practices as an alternative.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- 1) Restorative Justice Practices and alternatives to suspension
 - a) discipline staff will identify restorative justice practices to be used and which incidents they could be used for
 - b) will be used for discipline incidents as applicable
 - c) teachers will be taught de-escalation tactics

Person Responsible

Albert Cummings (albert.cummings@polk-fl.net)

2) Mentoring-

- a) New APA and other staff members will set up mentoring for students identified by EWS/discipline data

Person Responsible

Albert Cummings (albert.cummings@polk-fl.net)

3) Character Education Lessons

a) Students will have opportunities to participate in character development lessons once a month during the 3rd period block

Person Responsible Albert Cummings (albert.cummings@polk-fl.net)

4) PBIS

a) PBIS committee will monitor discipline data during monthly meetings

b) the committee will create events/rewards that will incentivize students for progress made toward this goal

c) teachers will receive PBIS implementation support from Behavior Interventionst and other committee members

Person Responsible Albert Cummings (albert.cummings@polk-fl.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Over the last few years, we have worked hard to increase implementation of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) throughout the campus. We have four expectations for our students:

- Be Responsible
- Be Respectful
- Be Safe
- Be Kind

The expectations will be shared at the beginning of the school year within the back to school discipline presentation. Expectations are communicated daily by administrators and teachers and posted throughout all locations on the school campus. Every location has a poster with examples of what the expectations look like for that specific area of campus.

Character lessons will be streamed monthly and as necessary. Discipline data is shared weekly in leadership meetings where we determine what areas our school needs more support in regarding a positive school culture. We also involve our students by having our TV students create mini video clips to be shown on our MustangTV channel.

Students are rewarded individually or whole group when expectations are met or exceeded. The PBIS committee meets monthly to discuss progress towards our goal of a more positive school environment. Our discipline department has used restorative justice practices, such as conflict resolution and character development to increase positive interactions on campus.

New this year, we are planning to partner with a few community leaders to start a mentoring partnership to support our high need students.

We will increase usage of social media platforms to communicate with families and community members and keep our stakeholders informed of what's happening on campus.

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

School administrators monitor and discuss data and observations during weekly meetings. This data is also shared with teachers during staff development days. Teachers are able at that time to discuss any trends they see in discipline and behavior as well as identify possible solutions.

Monthly SAC and PTO meetings are held in order for parents and community members to address any concerns. During these meetings, members also share any ideas and solutions to support a positive school climate and culture. Our SAC and PTO committee also provides funding to alleviate costs of materials and resources for our students.

Parent nights are hosted throughout the school year. During these events, families are invited to learn what the students are working on. They also receive information on how to support their child at home. Families are given surveys at the end of each event where they can provide feedback on the school environment.