

Martin County School District

Crystal Lake Elementary School



2020-21 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 | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Crystal Lake Elementary School

2095 SW 96TH ST, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/cles

Demographics

Principal: Brenda Watkins

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 39% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: C (52%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Crystal Lake Elementary School

2095 SW 96TH ST, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/cles

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | No | 42% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 38% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A | A | B | A |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

#BeTHEOne

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Watkins, Brenda | Principal | |
| Boggs, Joni | Instructional Coach | |
| Parker, Jennifer | Assistant Principal | |
| Hodowanic, Laura | School Counselor | |
| Francis, Michele | Instructional Coach | |
| DiGrazia, Kelly | Teacher, K-12 | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Brenda Watkins

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

7

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 39% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: C (52%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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 | 70 | 69 | 66 | 62 | 95 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 459 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 11 | 8 | 7 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/12/2020

Prior Year - 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 | 76 | 79 | 64 | 100 | 101 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 505 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | |

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 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | |

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 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Prior Year - 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 | 76 | 79 | 64 | 100 | 101 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 505 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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 | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 66% | 58% | 57% | 66% | 59% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 59% | 59% | 58% | 68% | 61% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 55% | 56% | 53% | 56% | 54% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 69% | 65% | 63% | 69% | 67% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 67% | 65% | 62% | 71% | 67% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 49% | 53% | 51% | 55% | 55% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 66% | 58% | 53% | 63% | 55% | 51% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

Grade Level Data

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 | 2019 | 69% | 54% | 15% | 58% | 11% |
| | 2018 | 51% | 57% | -6% | 57% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 18% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 58% | 57% | 1% | 58% | 0% |
| | 2018 | 67% | 55% | 12% | 56% | 11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 68% | 55% | 13% | 56% | 12% |
| | 2018 | 66% | 58% | 8% | 55% | 11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 69% | 58% | 11% | 62% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 64% | 63% | 1% | 62% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 71% | 67% | 4% | 64% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 66% | 64% | 2% | 62% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 64% | 64% | 0% | 60% | 4% |
| | 2018 | 74% | 64% | 10% | 61% | 13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 65% | 53% | 12% | 53% | 12% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 69% | 54% | 15% | 55% | 14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 47 | 58 | 44 | 52 | 66 | 54 | 50 | | | | |
| ELL | 41 | 69 | | 64 | 69 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 54 | | | 46 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 67 | 92 | 64 | 74 | | 75 | | | | |
| MUL | 36 | | | 57 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 58 | 39 | 73 | 67 | 47 | 66 | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 64 | 68 | 54 | 58 | 48 | 45 | | | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 36 | 38 | 35 | 45 | 45 | 31 | 38 | | | | |
| ELL | 21 | | | 43 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 62 | | | 77 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 54 | 65 | | 65 | 61 | | 63 | | | | |
| MUL | 33 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 59 | 47 | 70 | 58 | 42 | 71 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 51 | 48 | 49 | 45 | 41 | 56 | | | | |
| 2017 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 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 28 | 42 | 41 | 46 | 53 | 29 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 54 | | 41 | 54 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | | | 67 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 54 | 48 | 45 | 69 | 66 | 64 | 54 | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | 72 | 58 | 69 | 72 | 53 | 64 | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | 58 | 58 | 53 | 61 | 44 | 50 | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 65 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 89 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 520 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 53 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 66 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 50 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 73 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 47 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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 | 60 |
| 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 | 60 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Per school grade: Lowest data component:

Math: Lowest Quartile learning gains was 50% .

*Our school has struggled with filling the guidance counselor position. This position helps to support MTSS

process and collecting data for targeted interventions.

*CLT meetings need more support.

* Many students struggle in all subject areas. We mainly focus on ELA interventions.

*5th grade Math cohort score dropped (2%). We reviewed teacher placement.

*Reviewing lowest quartile learning gains,

*2019-2020 W. I. N. (What I need time) is school wide allowing for cross grade level interventions groups/
more targeted skills.

Per ESSA Guidelines:

White ELA LQ 39%; Math LQ 49%

SWD: ELA Achievement 47%, Learning Gains 58%, LQ 44%

Sub Group Data: Multi-race (lowest subgroup) ELA Achievement 36% (Total 17 students Gr. 3-5)

*2018-2019 We focused heavily on ELL students.

* Multi-racial subgroup has not been a concerned focused group.

*2019-2020 Teachers have been asked if they know who their multi-racial students are and how to find out in

Focus. They have been asked to focus on all subgroups but especially multi-racial.

Goal for 2020-2021: Increase multi-race students ELA achievement level from 36% to 42% (6 points)

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

ELA Learning gains dropped from 62% to 59% (3%). Multi-racial students (17) achievement was 36% but was an increase of 3% from previous year. Black students (19) achievement was 54% (8% decreased). Hispanic students (63) achievement was 48% (6% decreased). Drilling down further into proficiency scores:

4th grade

Same Grade Comparison -9%

Cohort Comparison 7%

5th grade

Same Grade Comparison 2%

Cohort Comparison 1%

4th Grade: (4) gen ed teachers (2 ELA/ 2 Math/Science) + (1) 4th grade gifted teacher. One of the ELA teachers was struggling all year despite additional supports provided. Her scores accounted for 1/2 of all 4th grade ELA scores.

5th Grade: (4) gen ed teachers (2 ELA/ 2 Math/Science) + (1) 4th grade gifted teacher. Review teacher placement.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

CLE had only one component that was below the state average. Our Math LQ was 2% lower than the state; CLE 49%; the state was 51%. However, this was still a 6% increase from the previous year (43%) Black students (19) achievement score was 46 (31% decrease) .Drilling down further into proficiency scores:

4th grade

Same Grade Comparison 5%

Cohort Comparison 7%

5th grade

Same Grade Comparison -10%

Cohort Comparison -2%

Teacher placement was reviewed including strengths and weaknesses with subgroups. Adjustments were made. We lacked continual sustainable professional development for math instruction focusing on standards based instruction and student engagement.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Overall Math Learning gains showed the most improvement 58 - 67 (9% increase).
Overall ELA Achievement increased from 61% to 66% (5% increase)

Subgroup:

ELL student achievement increased 20%; Math achievement increased 21% (Subgroup focus for 2018-2019)

FRL ELA learning gains increased 13%; LQ increased 20%

We departmentalized in grades 3-5. Each team consisted of two teachers (one for ELA/Social Studies and the other STEM).

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

1. CLE's top concern of the EWS is attendance.
2. Second concern is retentions.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Math - increase learning gains for lowest quartile
2. ELA - increase learning gains for all students and for lowest quartile
3. Science - - increase proficiency
4. Expand our Positive Behavior Intervention Support program

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase learning gains for lowest quartile. iReady domain Numbers and Operations shows a need for improvement. Fact fluency, in all operations, needs to be mastered in each grade level. Lesson plans will reflect time to allow for student practice at least 3 times a week (Number Talks, Kagan structures, Flash cards). Also, by strengthening our core, our learning gains, proficiency, and lowest quartile will increase.

Measurable Outcome: 2018-19 FSA data showed an Increase overall math lowest quartile learning gains from 50% to 55% (+5%)
Increase math achievement for black students from 46% to 56% (+10%)

Also use iReady, iSM's, summative and formative assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: District math coach will work with teachers on standards based instruction and differentiation. District math coach will also work with teachers on monitoring for active student engagement through the use of Number Talks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: It is important for teachers to understand the complexity level of standards, design activities to engage students and also monitor to make sure student evidence matches the complexity level.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue with departmentalizing in grades 3-5 (teachers were selected based on iReady and FSA data)
2. Admin will meet with teachers to identify subgroups and lowest quartile students.
3. Continue supporting CLT (Collaborative Learning Teams)
4. District Math Coach will begin the year focusing on teachers in grades 3-5 (observing and providing follow up strategies, and monitoring for fidelity). Targeted planning for differentiation at the levels 2, 3, and 4 using the CRA model. Continue looking at data using summative and common formative assessments to monitor student progress and create interventions.
5. Grades K-2 are implementing Number Talks. This year "Number Talks: Whole Number Computation, Grades K-5" book will be ordered for 3rd and 4th grade math teachers; "Number Talks: Fractions, Decimals, and Percentages" book will be ordered for the 5th grade math teachers. District math coach will support new teachers and will refer to strategies in these books to implement in the classrooms.
6. District instructional Math Coach will work with teachers on evidence based strategy district based coach working on standards based strategies and differentiated instruction. District coach will continue working with teachers in grades K-2, 3-5 who need more support with Number Talks. District coach and assistant principal will look at data using summative and common formative assessments to monitor student progress and for differentiation/interventions.
7. Learning Walks-vertical groups, follow up with questions, clarifications, celebrate success, identify areas of needs.
8. Provide double blocks of time to review MTSS data and plan for next steps.
9. Provide tutoring during the day and/or after school by certified teacher(s) with direct targeted instruction.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Area of focus in Science is to increase proficiency. Science scores dropped from 68% to 66% in 2018-19. That is a decrease of -2%. All measurable sub groups increased except FRL which dropped from 56% to 45% which is a -11% decrease. White also decreased from 71% to 66% (-5%).

Measurable Outcome: Increase Science proficiency from a 66% to 68%.
Continue focusing on all sub groups by differentiating instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Parker (parkerj1@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement differentiation strategies to help all students with comprehension and mastering skills. Continue to use District Science Coordinator to help with strategies and benchmarks to target additional strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Too many times we target lower subgroups to help with proficiency and forget about more successful grouping (e.g. all measurable sub groups increased except FRL which dropped from 56% to 45% (-11%) and white from 71% to 65% (-5%)). By differentiating for ALL students we can make sure we are addressing the needs of all students and not just specific subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue with departmentalizing in grades 3-5 (teachers were selected based on Benchmark and FSA data)
2. Choice and Voice - Science option gives students in grades 4-5 more consecutive days to go deeper into learning standards.
3. 5th Grade teachers will review and modify instruction based on summative and formative assessments (including Science PMT's)
4. More hands on exposure to science on Early Release Days. (helps with attendance)
5. Cares Project and Science supply money can be used to buy consumables for science hands on activities
6. Focus on standards that are taught in third and not in fourth.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: FSA: Increase ELA learning gains for lowest quartile (with scores from 2018-2019) from 55 to 59% (4%) focusing more on the Hispanic and ESE populations. There are students who fit into multiple subgroups. 2018-2019 FSA Data shows Hispanic - EL population (2 actively in EL; 4 are in 2 year followup; 4 are in 3-4 year followup; 1 exited more than 4 years.) ESE population shows 6/15 are Hispanic.

Measurable Outcome: FSA: Increase ELA learning gains for lowest quartile (with scores from 2018-2019) from 55 to 59% (4%) focusing more on the Hispanic and ESE populations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brenda Watkins (watkinb@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiated instruction
Guided Reading Instruction
Writing (narrative, expository, persuasive)
Standards based instruction including planning and delivery (including online instruction)
Professional Development in reading and writing

Teachers will use various ELA data to determine strengths and weaknesses for each student. First and second grade teachers will use running records to create grouping and each individual student's need(s). Guided reading gives students the chance to apply the strategies they already know to new text. Teachers provide support, but the ultimate goal is independent reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In grades 3-5 teachers are focusing on Strategy based groups. Strategy groups are formed based on classroom observation, F&P assessment, ism, performance on iReady lessons. The ultimate goal is independent reading.
The teacher selects a text for a small group of students who are similar in their reading behaviors at a particular point in time. In general, the text is about right for students in the group.

An unprecedented pandemic may change the definition of classroom, but it doesn't have to change the definition of good teaching. Teachers need more strategies for digital instruction. Jennifer Serravello's book "Connecting with Students Online: Strategies for Remote Teaching & Learning" is a newly released book. Teachers have attended Jennifer Serravello trainings on reading instruction and are excited about the release of this new book on a topic they are seeking for more support.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue departmentalizing in grades 3-5 (teachers are selected based on iReady and FSA data)
2. Continue supporting CLT (Collaborative Learning Teams)
3. Compare all data (FLKRS, PAST, iReady, Running Records, FSA (as appropriate))
4. Provide professional development for literacy strategies including differentiating instruction.
5. Literacy Coach will focus on new teachers and guided reading in grades 1-2
6. Intervention strategies will be addressed through school wide WIN (What I Need Time). Groupings will be formed based on skill needs and may cross over grade levels. *Foundations *Words Their Way *LLI *Heggerty's *Visualizing and Verbalizing *Mondo
7. Increase focus on writing, increase focus on using DBQ strategies and methods. Great Reads used as a literary essay resource is used in grades 4-5 gifted.
8. Learning Walks - vertical groups, follow up with questions, clarifications, celebrate success, identify areas of

needs

9. Utilize district instructional coach to work with new teachers, teachers with specific needs and gifted planning and instruction.
10. Provide double blocks of time to review MTSS data and plan for next steps.
11. Purchase Jennifer Serravello's book "Connecting with Students Online: Strategies for Remote Teaching & Learning" for a book study.
12. Create subgroups in iReady for lowest quartile students.
13. DBQ training for teachings in grades 3rd & 5th (we have 4th's Florida History) - SS with informational reading and writing <https://www.dbqproject.com/product-category/mini-qs/elementary/>
14. Raz-Plus Running Record how to video with recording. (Literacy Coach)
15. Provide tutoring during the day and/or after school by certified teacher(s) with direct targeted instruction.
16. Continue to research and purchase webinars for groups of teachers to attend on reading and writing strategies.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Attendance

Crystal Lake Elementary implemented a new initiative this year called Choice and Voice for 4th and 5th grade students. Studying attendance trends, we noticed students were usually in attendance on the days of their preferred related arts classes.

Choice and Voice gives students the opportunity to select their favorite related arts to take every day for a nine week period. During the first two weeks of school students attended all related arts classes to determine which one they wanted to take every day for the rest of the nine weeks. Each Related Arts teacher presented a project or activity students would be completing if selecting their course. Students completed a survey on their choice. By students attending the same related arts each day, related arts teachers will develop deeper relationships with students that will help with mentoring.

4th and 5th grade levels were combined for the same time period for related arts. This opened up a period of time for related arts teachers to provide enrichment activities and mentoring during school wide WIN (What I Need Time). 4th and 5th grade teachers are able to meet together for vertical planning.

Additional, incentive activities will be provided during the school year. (e.g. classes with perfect attendance will be entered into drawings for rewards like a special recess activity)

Retentions

Crystal Lake Elementary have 2 students with double retentions. Alternative options are being reviewed to determine if students are candidates to be promoted to the next grade level in an effort to get them closer to their cohorts. FSA and iReady ELA data are reviewed to determine areas of need to focus on and an alternative schedule created to provide additional instruction in ELA to prepare to take and pass the SAT 10 for the next grade level up.

By identifying struggling students early and intervening will discourage/prevent retention in grades K-2. This may include an alternative schedule to increase ELA instructional time.

Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS)

Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) program promotes a school community with common school wide expectations. In addition:

Regular news videos promoting expectations as well as classroom lessons.

Teachers will address behaviors individually and as a group.

Students will earn Hawk bucks to participate in monthly school events.

Cafeteria expectations will be address with weekly rewards.

Provide a kickoff meeting with information and additional trainings and rewards for teachers/staff as needed.

Incorporate Character Counts! themes into PBIS

2020-2021: Due to the elimination of large group events to celebrated positive behavior, Crystal Lake Elementary will focus on individual positive recognition. A "positive office referral" will be implemented where teachers select one student per class biweekly to get this award. On Friday, the Principal and Assistant Principal will create a "prize patrol-like" event during lunch using the microphone to announce students during their lunch period so their peers will hear and see. Students will receive a certificate and a "prize".

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

This school year everyone is dealing with COVID-19. School started on time with many apprehensive about what this year would look like. In addition, students were not in school the last 9 weeks of the 2019-2020 school year. Meeting the social and emotional needs for everyone (staff, students and their families) is very important. We will continue with programs implemented in previous years to address social and emotional needs of teachers.

Guidance Counselor will:

Coordinate to provide school-wide or grade level specific activities to promote (i.e. Bullying Awareness, areas of current social concerns.)

Small group/ individual meeting as needed

Bullying Awareness prevention

Work with teachers on Character Counts! themes

For students:

Tykes and Teens will:

Communicate with parents

Counsel with students

Sanford Harmony and Restorative Circle Lessons - (All grades K-5) lessons will be provided one time a week for each.

Botvin - Lessons are provided for students in grades 3-5. Botvin LifeSkills Training (LST) is a research-validated substance abuse prevention program proven to reduce the risks of alcohol, tobacco, drug abuse, and violence by targeting the major social and psychological factors that promote the initiation of substance use and other risky behaviors. This comprehensive and exciting program provides adolescents and young teens with the confidence and skills necessary to successfully handle challenging situations.

Select Support staff/teachers

Check in check out with specific students to provide encouragement

Select teachers will be selected as mentors and matched with students.

--

For teachers/Staff:

Administration is providing various positive notes and treats for staff to show them how they are appreciated. Preschool days meetings were minimized to give teachers more time to plan for in person and remote lessons. The school purchased additional supplies and materials to help minimize stress in teaching

both in person and remote learners. Remote learners have been a challenge. Administration continues to help support teachers, follow up and attend meetings with parents to address concerns.

Also, teachers are given choices between attending meetings in person or on Zoom. They select based on their comfortable level.

The local Health Department nurse spoke to staff about a month into the school year about COVID findings, what is quarantine, when do students go home and for how long. Also, it was stressed that the virus is not being passed in schools. It is coming in from outside activities either by students or someone in their family. Of those students and staff quarantined district wide, no one tested positive or developed COVID symptoms. Masks and disinfecting, including washing hands, plays an important part.

Administration continues to encourage teachers to share their concerns opening without criticism. Teacher input into problem solving is greatly appreciated and honored whenever possible.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--|--|--------------------------|-----|--------------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | \$3,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0301 - Crystal Lake Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$1,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Purchase Number Talk Books</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 160-Other Support Personnel | 0301 - Crystal Lake Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Tutoring during and after the school day.</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | | | | \$3,928.85 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0301 - Crystal Lake Elementary School | General Fund | | \$2,003.85 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Purchase consumables for Science lessons. 1000-5100-4510-0301-0082</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0301 - Crystal Lake Elementary School | Other | | \$1,925.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Care Grant funds to purchase science supplies 1000-5100-0422</i> | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$12,341.36 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0301 - Crystal Lake Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$1,300.00 |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|------|---|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------|
| | | | <i>Notes: Purchase Jennifer Serravello's book "Connecting with Students Online: Strategies for Remote Teaching & Learning" for a book study. (35 books @</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 160-Other Support Personnel | 0301 - Crystal Lake Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$2,541.36 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Tutoring during and after the school day.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 160-Other Support Personnel | 0301 - Crystal Lake Elementary School | Other | | \$6,500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Tutoring during and after the school day.</i> | | | |
| | 5100 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 0301 - Crystal Lake Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Webinars</i> | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$19,270.21 |