

Broward County Public Schools

# Cresthaven Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Cresthaven Elementary School

801 NE 25TH ST, Pompano Beach, FL 33064

[ no web address on file ]

### Demographics

**Principal: Donald Lee**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (57%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (44%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Cresthaven Elementary School

801 NE 25TH ST, Pompano Beach, FL 33064

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">95%</p>

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

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

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

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

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Donald Lee

**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.*

2

**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.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

30

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

469

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

7

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

4

**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	80	74	77	68	91	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	474
Attendance below 90 percent	41	20	27	21	23	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	1	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	26	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	36	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	7	5	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

**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	2	7	18	36	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	4	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	12	14	7	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	12	14	7	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	47%	58%	56%				44%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						51%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						49%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	54%	54%	50%				53%	65%	63%
Math Learning Gains	79%						63%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	74%						49%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	59%	59%				37%	46%	53%

**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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	31%	60%	-29%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	62%	-16%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2022					
	2019	35%	59%	-24%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	52%	65%	-13%	62%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	48%	67%	-19%	64%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	64%	-20%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	36%	49%	-13%	53%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						

**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	15	44	45	22	63	67	8				
ELL	38	59	45	47	78	71	36				
BLK	46	64	56	48	74	74	24				
HSP	44	64	50	59	88	80	38				
FRL	45	64	55	54	81	76	29				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	9	39	55	9	24	18					
ELL	27	49	62	29	23	13	13				
BLK	29	57	58	28	24	27	15				
HSP	36	41		31	18		21				
FRL	32	52	65	28	22	12	21				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	38	31	21	40	38	17				
ELL	40	55	48	48	57	39	33				
BLK	37	46	44	55	68	58	32				
HSP	42	50	53	46	55	44	33				
WHT	82	69		82	85						
FRL	44	52	50	53	63	50	35				

**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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	449
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?**

Students in grades 3,4, and 5 including all subgroups increased proficiency in reading, math and science by at least 10 points. The highest gains were in math where proficiency increased by 24 percentage points. The learning gains in math had more than a 50 point increase.

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

The greatest need for improvement was demonstrated in ELA for all grades and subgroups. The ELA learning gains of students in the lowest quartile decreased by 12 percentage points.

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

Fidelity of the program and staff and student attendance likely contributed to the need for improvement. To address this, some actions to take are: close monitoring of attendance with frequent parent communication/ support and providing all tiered interventions with fidelity.

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

Students making learning gains in math showed the most improvement especially students in all sub groups.

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

Some contributing factors were collaborative lesson planning, data analysis in PLCs, direct instruction with Acaletics math program, close monitoring of iReady lesson, and tutor/ELO camps.

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

Implementation of Tier 1 instruction through Benchmark Advance, fidelity of small group and intervention instruction, data analysis to target areas of concern, and continuation of tutor camps.

**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.**

Instructional coaches will provide individualized support for select teachers and teachers will attend district webinars and trainings. Admin will provide feedback after routine classroom visits and PLCs will focus on aligning BEST standards and data to high quality tier 1 instruction.

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

Some additional services are implementation of push in support for ELLs and SWDs. Language enrichment camps will be conducted for ELLs. All students will have access to an integrated learning program, Freckles.

### **Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

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

Although Students with Disabilities (SWD) increased from 22% to 39% based on the FSA in reading and math, there is still a need to increase proficiency.

**Measurable  
Outcome:**

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

By June 2023, students with disabilities will increase proficiency and learning gains in math and ELA by at least 3 points as measured by by the FAST 2023.

**Monitoring:**

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

Student data, such as PM 1 and PM2 will be closely monitored to ensure that improvement is occurring. Student data will be discussed with teachers at quarterly student reviews to determine how standards can be related to IEPs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Donald Lee (donald.lee@browardschools.com)

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

Some evidence-based strategies will be implemented such as the Horizon program for students struggling with Phonics and Benchmark Advance Interventions for students with comprehension areas of concern. Guided reading at each student's instructional level will be conducted using a gradual release of responsibility model. A evidence-based math program, Acaletics will be used to provide a spiraling curriculum of standards.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Students with disabilities will be provided differentiated instruction targeted to their needs and IEP goals. ESE support facilitators will provide push-in services and small group instruction using Horizon's for students with phonics/decoding concerns or Benchmark Advance interventions for comprehension.

**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.

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

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

Administration will lead students reviews (data chats) with teachers and support to monitor student progress.

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



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

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

Based on performance on FSA in ELA 2022 , the need for increasing proficiency for grades 3,4, and 5 was identified especially in the area of learning gains. There was a 12 point decrease in learning gains of the lowest quartile in ELA. ELA proficiency was 47% in 2022.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By June 2023, students in grades 3,4,and 5 will increase ELA proficiency and learning gains by at least 5 points as measured by the FAST 2023.

**Monitoring:**

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

Students are monitored through weekly assessments using Benchmark Advance and the Progress Monitoring Assessments, (PM1 and PM2(FAST). Quarterly student reviews/data chats and classroom observations will be conducted to monitor individual student progress.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Donald Lee (donald.lee@browardschools.com)

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

Support staff and teachers will fill in foundational gaps through identification of students areas of concern based on progress monitoring assessments (weekly unit assessments). Evidence-based Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will be provided as needed through use of Horizons, LLI, Foundations, and Benchmark Advance Intervention program..

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Using Benchmark Advance weekly assessments, PM1 and 2 tests, and Horizons program embedded tests can prescribe effective lessons to address areas of concern to close the achievement gap.

**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.

Data analysis through PLCs will target instruction or remediation of ELA standards.

**Person Responsible**

Donald Lee (donald.lee@browardschools.com)

Based on multi-tiered levels of support, CPST will identify and prescribe reading interventions.

**Person Responsible**

Jamie Addeo (jamieaddeo@browardschools.com)

Support staff and paraprofessionals will provide push-in lessons to target students with Limited English skills.

**Person Responsible**

Jan Heavner (jan.heavner@browardschools.com)

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

All students are provided with the Florida Benchmark Advance curriculum as the Tier 1 instruction. Kindergarten and Grade 1 were above 50% proficiency in Reading/ELA. Based on the Primary End of the Year Reading Test, our area of focus will be on 2nd grade students who had only 43% of students proficient (score of 65% or above). However, that was a substantial increase from the previous year of 17% proficient on EOY test. Students are provided with an intervention in small groups if they are not on track to pass the FAST.

### Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Students in grades 3 (47% proficient), 4 (43% proficient), and grade 5 (47% proficient) in ELA FSA 2022, are the area of focus. Last year we were an Intensive level of support school and this year Cresthaven is considered a Universal level of support school. Tier 1 instruction will be the Core program, Florida Benchmark Advance. Students are provided with an intervention in small groups if they are not on track to pass the FAST.

### Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Based on the End of the Year Primary Reading test 2022, 43% of the students in grade 2 were proficient. By June, 2023, 51% of the 2nd grade students will be proficient as measured by the FAST, PM 3.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Based on 2022 FSA in ELA, 47% of students in grades 3,4,and 5 were proficient. By June 2023, students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will increase ELA proficiency to 51% or above.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Teachers will analyze data in progress monitoring assessments, such as FAST and Benchmark Advance Unit tests. Administration and support staff will conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide feedback to teachers. Academic coaches will offer instructional strategy support to teachers as needed.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lee, Donald, donald.lee@browardschools.com

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Benchmark Advance Interventions are provided to students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. The Horizon program for phonics is provided to students as a Tier 3 intervention. The Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) is also conducted in small groups for students in reading interventions. All programs are aligned to BEST standards.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The evidence based instructional programs address the identified areas of need. Last year great gains were made using Horizons, LLI, and Benchmark Advance Interventions.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

The Literacy coach provides support to teachers based on data/areas of need. Professional development is provided to teachers during employee planning Days and small "bites" of instruction are offered bi weekly after school. Administration and the Literacy Coach attend webinars provided through Just Read, Florida specific to Universal tiers of support.

Addeo, Jamie,  
jamieaddeo@browardschools.com

**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.**

Each day at Cresthaven starts with building a positive culture when all students are greeted with a smile by staff members. The staff utilizes strategies planned for in our Social emotional Learning (SEL) plan. The school counselor conducts small groups with students to target SEL needs. School-wide events for staff and the community are planned to strengthen ties among stakeholders.

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

Cresthaven elementary staff develops the "whole child" in cognitive and emotional domains. The school counselor, the School Advisory Council (SAC) and the School Advisory Forum (SAF) as well as PTA are all encouraged to get involved in the school's vision. Community mentors are invited to participate in school events. Title I funds are used to provide engaging activities that assist parents with strategies to help their children at home. The school support staff designs parent events such as Reading, Math, and ESOL Family Nights.