Crystal Lake Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Crystal Lake Elementary School

700 GALVIN DR, Lakeland, FL 33801

http:// schools.polk-fl.net/crystallakeelementary

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Crystal Lake Elementary - A Community Partnership School's mission is to create an enriching, encouraging, and engaging environment for all students. We will collaborate with staff, students, and parents to incorporate real-world experiences while preparing students to S.O.A.R. (Show Respect, Outstanding Character, Academic Pride, and Resolve Problems Peacefully).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Crystal Lake Elementary - A Community Partnership School's vision is to provide all students with a safe, consistent learning environment where every student will S.O.A.R. (Show Respect, Outstanding Character, Academic Pride, and Resolve Problems Peacefully).

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Taveras, Marlene	Principal	Oversee and provide strategic direction; monitor student achievement; encourage parent involvement; monitor, develop and revise policies and procedures; create and execute an accurate and efficient budget; recruit, hire and evaluate highly effective certified staff; and oversee facilities. Develop and nurture positive relationships with community agencies to operationalize the goals and objectives outlined in the strategic plan for the Community Partnership Schools.
Vann, Ingrid	Assistant Principal	Support and participate in daily school functions; prepare for and organize all aspects of testing; enforce positive behavior and collaborate with staff and parents concerning discipline; participate and collaborate with teachers during lesson planning and curriculum alignment; all other duties as assigned.
Castro, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	As ELA Literacy Coach, plan for all ELA lessons using B.E.S.T. Standards and the continuing Florida Standards, provide coaching cycles for all teachers, identify and coordinate literacy K-5 activities, and support admin with other academically-focused activities.
Hagan, Andrea	Administrative Support	Manage, oversee, and supervise the execution and hours of operation of a network of expanded learning opportunities (after school tutoring, mentoring, youth development, youth empowerment and enrichment clubs) and comprehensive support services (medical, dental, and behavioral healthcare, social/emotional well-being, and prevention) within the school in partnership with school leadership. Identify, develop and make determinations for after school programming, health care and other support services that align with the collective vision of Community Partnership Schools and are identified through a needs assessment process. Develop and nurture positive relationships with school administrators and relevant community agencies to operationalize the partnership.
Perez, Angelica	Other	As reading interventionist, work with retained and lowest 25 percentile students in reading, implement reading interventions, and support tier 3 students.
	School Counselor	Serve on the Leadership Team, support students and teachers in ESE process, support MTSS process and support with PBIS and behavior interventions.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The leadership team met to evaluate last year's school improvement plan, the implementation strategies and support systems and the outcomes achieved and not achieved. We analyzed the data and discussed what our goals for 2023-2024 will be. During the Strategic Planning for the Community Partnership School, the data was presented, and goals were discussed. Input from the partnership cabinet was used to finalize the goals for this school year.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be at the forefront of all planning sessions and data chats that will occur throughout the year. We will start our conversations and collaboration around the SIP goals during pre-planning week. Committees that will analyze the data collected for each goal will be formed. Students with the greatest achievement gaps will be identified and specific, targeted instruction will be provided. Ongoing assessments will be used to analyze the impact of the instruction provided and interventions and support will be revised as needed.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	77%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: D 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: C

School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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**	
Absent 10% or more days	32	33	29	27	24	23	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	6	4	12	15	14	17	0	0	0	68
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	11	14	11	29	8	13	0	0	0	86
Course failure in Math	9	8	4	30	6	11	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	39	21	24	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	37	18	32	0	0	0	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	18	23	24	31	17	24	0	0	0	137

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	8	15	12	42	23	34	0	0	0	134

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	1	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	33	27	26	27	20	40	0	0	0	173
One or more suspensions	4	3	6	1	6	22	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	29	23	46	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	28	51	0	0	0	109
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	25	36	38	31	23	28	0	0	0	181

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	22	8	16	20	29	58	0	0	0	153

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	33	27	26	27	20	40	0	0	0	173
One or more suspensions	4	3	6	1	6	22	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	29	23	46	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	28	51	0	0	0	109
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	25	36	38	31	23	28	0	0	0	181

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	22	8	16	20	29	58	0	0	0	153

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	26	45	53	26	47	56	21		
ELA Learning Gains				44			26		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				21			42		
Math Achievement*	32	49	59	28	42	50	12		
Math Learning Gains				54			24		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			38		
Science Achievement*	13	41	54	29	49	59	14		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	38	54	59	44			41		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	26
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	131
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	303
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	21	Yes	4	2
ELL	24	Yes	3	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	14	Yes	4	1
HSP	22	Yes	2	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	38	Yes	1	

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	25	Yes	2	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	19	Yes	3	1
ELL	29	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	3	
HSP	34	Yes	1	
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	46			
FRL	38	Yes	1	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	26			32			13					38
SWD	19			25			20				3	
ELL	16			26							4	38
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19			27			0				4	
HSP	20			25			6				5	41
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	36			44			33				4	
FRL	23			28			11				5	42

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	26	44	21	28	54	57	29					44
SWD	14	19	7	17	37	29	12					
ELL	13	26		23	47		21					44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18	42	27	18	59	63	20					
HSP	24	38		25	47		26					45
MUL	40			40								
PAC												
WHT	39	48		43	58		43					
FRL	24	43	24	26	54	60	26					45

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	21	26	42	12	24	38	14					41
SWD	3	14		3	13		0					
ELL	19	19		13	38		14					41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	10	27		4	22		0					
HSP	21	29		14	33		14					44
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	31	20		18	8		30					
FRL	21	33	42	13	27	33	18					44

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	26%	43%	-17%	54%	-28%
04	2023 - Spring	30%	53%	-23%	58%	-28%
03	2023 - Spring	20%	42%	-22%	50%	-30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	35%	51%	-16%	59%	-24%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	56%	-16%	61%	-21%
05	2023 - Spring	18%	44%	-26%	55%	-37%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	16%	39%	-23%	51%	-35%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Data components showing the lowest performances are 5th Grade Science (16% proficient), 5th Grade Math (18% proficient) and 3rd Grade ELA (20% proficient).
Contributing factors to last year's low performance were: 48% of 5th grade students had below 90% attendance. Science and math benchmarks build on each other and excessive absenteeism impacts the progression of learning. Additional coaching support was needed for teachers. The teachers in these areas were new to teaching and new to Florida standards/benchmarks. There was a teacher lack of understanding of the benchmarks. Also, in 3rd grade ELA, there was a mid-year staff change that impacted 2 out of 4 classes.

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

The data components that showed the greatest decline was 5th Grade Science (difference of 13%) and 5th Grade Math (difference of 6%).
Contributing factors to last year's low performance were: 48% of 5th grade students had below 90% attendance. Science and math benchmarks build on each other and excessive absenteeism impacts the progression of learning. Additional coaching support was needed for teachers. The teachers in these areas were new to teaching and new to Florida standards/benchmarks. There was a teacher lack of understanding of the benchmarks.

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.

The data components that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 5th Grade Science (difference of 35%) and 3rd Grade ELA (difference of 30%).
Contributing factors to last year's low performance were: 48% of 5th grade students had below 90% attendance. Science and math benchmarks build on each other and excessive absenteeism impacts the progression of learning. Additional coaching support was needed for teachers. The teachers in these areas were new to teaching and new to Florida standards/benchmarks. There was a teacher lack of understanding of the benchmarks. Also, in 3rd grade ELA, there was a mid-year staff change that impacted 2 out of 4 classes.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 4th Grade Math (13% increase) and 4th Grade ELA (6% increase). The actions taken in this area was the use of Nearpod lessons to integrate technology and provide equivalent experiences in math. Support was provided by the reading coach through co-teaching. The teachers teaching these content areas had experience teaching in Polk from previous year(s).

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

One area of concern is attendance. More than 30% of 3rd-5th grade students have missed 10% or more days of school. Another concern is that more than 25% of 3rd-5th grade students had one or more suspensions.

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

Highest priority for school improvement is to support teachers in understanding the benchmarks through the learning arc process. Another priority is to provide teachers with coaching support in the area of instructional delivery by school-based and district-based coaches. In addition, the administrative team will use the school-based walkthrough tool to collect data and provide feedback on teacher lesson planning and delivery.
Priority is to increase Science proficiency in 5th grade, demonstrate learning gains and/or proficiency in ELA for retained 3rd grade students, increase Math proficiency for incoming 4th grade students and increase ELA proficiency for incoming 4th grade students.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Focusing on Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction emphasizes the need to provide equivalent experiences that are aligned to state expectations for students, improve teacher knowledge and pedagogy using standards-based protocols for the Learning Arc Framework, and progress monitor student learning. In a review of student performance on the Spring 2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T), 3rd-5th grade ELA proficiency was 24% and 3rd-5th Math proficiency was 32%. On the 5th Grade Statewide Science Assessment (SSA) 5th Grade Science Proficiency was 16%. The low performance indicates potential gaps in instructional practices that are used to meet student needs on the Florida Standards. Throughout the school year there will be a focus on aligning the curriculum with instructional strategies, providing equivalent experiences for students, progress monitoring student learning, and teacher use of the Learning Arc Framework for planning.

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

Based on increased teacher knowledge and application of the Learning Arc Framework, and increased progress monitoring of equivalent experiences, K-5 classroom teachers will provide students with equivalent grade-level experiences daily. As a result of the teachers providing students with equivalent grade-level experiences daily, ELA achievement will increase from 24% to 35%+, math achievement will increase from 32% to 42%+, and science achievement will increase from 16% to 30+%.

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

The outcome of teacher professional development related to instructional practice will be monitored using grade-level equivalent experiences through student performance on district-based Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMAs) and Response to Data (RtD) reading assessments. Progress monitoring for ELA will use STAR Reading, iStation, Write Score, Reading Wonders bi-weekly Tests, RtD assessments, and monthly fluency tests. Also, progress monitoring for math will use STAR Math, district math module assessments, RtD math assessments, and Freckle Math. In addition, progress monitoring for science will use district quarterly assessments, science unit tests, and RtD science assessments.
Teacher outcomes will be measure as follow:
*STAR tri-annual data at Achievement Level 3
*IStation monthly progress at 51 percentile of class proficiency
*District RTD and Math Module Assessments bi-weekly progress monitoring at a 60 percentile.
*Reading Wonders bi-weekly at 70% and above proficient.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marlene Taveras (marlene.taveras@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Monitor K-5 students engaging in equivalent grade-level experiences aligned to state expectations using Standards Walkthrough Tool (SWT).
2. Provide K-5 teachers with the standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Framework.
3. Provide identified students with reading interventions through the use of corrective reading and number worlds.

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

Corrective Reading is designed to promote reading accuracy (decoding), fluency, and comprehension skills of students in grade 3 or higher who are reading below their grade level. The program has four levels that correspond to students' decoding skills. All lessons in the program are sequenced and scripted. Corrective Reading can be implemented in small groups of 4–5 students or in a whole-class format. Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for Elementary. Taking early action may be key to helping students struggling with mathematics.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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.

Effective planning using the learning arc framework during weekly collaborative planning sessions will be facilitated by instructional coaches and supported by administration and senior coordinators of instruction.

Person Responsible: Marlene Taveras (marlene.taveras@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly until the end of the school year.

Identify retained and lowest 25 percentile students in reading. Reading interventionist will facilitate interventions through corrective reading and standards-based lessons. Collect weekly reading data for identified students.

Person Responsible: Marlene Taveras (marlene.taveras@polk-fl.net)

By When: Daily until end of year.

Identify retained and lowest 25 percentile students in math. Math interventionist will facilitate interventions through Number Worlds and standards-based lessons. Collect weekly math data for identified students.

Person Responsible: Ingrid Vann (ingrid.vann@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly until the end of the school year.

Weekly walkthroughs will be conducted by administration using the Standards Walkthrough Tool (SWT) to look for trends and support teachers in the alignment of focus boards, instructional delivery and assessing student learning.

Person Responsible: Marlene Taveras (marlene.taveras@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly until the end of the school year.

Progress monitoring for all students on benchmark assessments will be collected biweekly. Data will be reviewed bi-weekly and next steps will be discussed for specific students or additional instruction needed for benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Marlene Taveras (marlene.taveras@polk-fl.net)

By When: Bi-Weekly until the end of the year.

Coaching support will be provided to teachers by school-based and district-based coaches.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Castro (jennifer.russo@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the week.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Crystal Lake Elementary recorded 480 discipline referrals last year. More than 25% of students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade were suspended one or more times. A PBIS schoolwide plan is not currently implemented at Crystal Lake Elementary.

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to decrease out of school suspension to less than 15% of students being suspended one or more times. A schoolwide PBIS system will be implement. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based, tiered framework for supporting students' behavioral, academic, social, emotional, and mental health. When implemented with fidelity, PBIS improves social emotional competence, academic success, and school climate. A school-wide system will be in place where students are receiving individualized recognition for positive behavior as well as whole-class recognition for positive behavior. This allows students to work on individual behavior goals as well as recognize that their behavior as a class is also important.

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

Total discipline incidents data will be monitored by using FOCUS (student information management system) to analyze the number of monthly Code of Conduct violations and the consequences administered.

The Serenity Nest, a therapeutic support program will also serve as a multi-tiered system of support to monitor student discipline. This safe space allows for students to self-regulate in a calm, relational setting and to further assist them in transferring their knowledge to the classroom and limit off task and disruptive behavior.

As part of the PBIS system that will be implemented, a 20 minute activity will be provided monthly for student to participate in as a reward for positive behavior as well as a recognition of one student of the month per class (someone adhering to the school-wide expectations of Showing respect, Outstanding character, Academic Pride and Resolve problems peacefully).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Ingrid Vann (ingrid.vann@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Reducing Behavior Problems in the Elementary School Classroom (September 2008): Classroom teachers, in coordination with other school personnel (administrators, grade-level teams, and special educators), can benefit from adopting a schoolwide approach to preventing problem behaviors and increasing positive social interactions among students and with school staff. This type of systemic approach requires a shared responsibility on the part of all school personnel, particularly the administrators who establish and support consistent schoolwide practices and the teachers who implement these practices both in their individual classrooms and beyond.

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

Reviewing total discipline incidents data will provide insights regarding which students are committing the most discipline violations, which teachers require classroom management support, and what alternatives to suspension can be used to improve student behavior while simultaneously providing support to students and teachers.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

As a trauma informed school, staff will receive extensive training on Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) and their impact on student achievement. Staff will be provided with the most relevant information about trauma-informed education and helps prepare them for implementation of trauma-informed socioemotional learning.
Staff will learn the following:
*What lifelong impacts do ACEs have, both medically and psychologically.
* Why early identification of trauma is so critical.
* Trauma and toxic stress are pervasive.
* Trauma inhibits students' executive functioning as well as their mental and physical
health.
* Layers of the traumatic experience.
* How trauma schemas distort perception.
* Differentiate vicarious trauma from compassion fatigue or burnout.
* Identify and set in place preventive practices for self and community care to
combat the effects of vicarious trauma.
* How to deepen relationships with students via open conversation.

Person Responsible: Marlene Taveras (marlene.taveras@polk-fl.net)

By When: Professional development at the beginning of the school year and additional professional development during the second semester.

Discipline data will be reviewed monthly by the PBIS committee and interventions that are in place will be continued if they are working or revised as needed. A proactive approach will be discussed for students who are repeatedly receiving referrals. Support will be given to teachers with the implementation of PBIS strategies.

Person Responsible: Ingrid Vann (ingrid.vann@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly throughout the school year.

Staff will receive training in PBIS and how to implement it successfully. A committee will meet regularly to access implementation and supports needed. Through the implementation of a schoolwide PBIS system, there is common language across grade levels for expectations and consequences. It is a system designed to promote a range of positive behaviors by defining expectations for conduct. If a student fails to meet these standards of behavior, the PBIS framework offers a pathway to address and correct the problem behavior.

Person Responsible: Marlene Taveras (marlene.taveras@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing until the end of the year.

The Community Partnership School will support in accomplishing this goal through the four pillars of community schools; collaborative leadership, expanded learning, wellness, and family and community engagement. Parent education, enrichment opportunities, and other supports to students, families and the community will be facilitated by the Director of Community Partnership Schools who will combine rigorous academic programs and a wide-range of in-school services, supports and opportunities to promote children's learning and development. This collaborative effort unites the most important influences in a child's life- school, family and community. It creates a common vision to create an integrated set of learning opportunities physically and socially, multiple common goals that include school readiness; student academic success; physical, social and emotional health; and parent and community engagement.

Person Responsible: Andrea Hagan (andrea.hagan@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing until the end of the year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The school-based administrative team met with the district title 1 senior coordinator and district regional to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. Behavior and academic data were analyzed when making decisions.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Based PM3 2022-2023 STAR data, 56% of K-2nd grade students are scoring below the 40th percentile in reading.
Our focus to improve reading proficiency will occur through an emphasis on phonemic awareness, phonics, and decoding in the primary (K-2) grades. Differentiation needs to occur within the classroom. for intervention and acceleration. Instruction will also be inclusive of aligned, benchmark-based

instruction through the use of the Learning Arc for all students and implementation of SRA Reading Mastery as an intervention for identified students.

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

Based PM3 2022-23, FAST data, 24% of students in 3-5 were proficient. The identification and implementation of appropriate and effective resources used with fidelity is an area of need. Our focus to improve reading proficiency will occur through an emphasis on comprehension and fluency in the intermediate grades (3-5). Differentiation needs to occur within the classroom for intervention and acceleration. Instruction will also be inclusive of
aligned, benchmark-based instruction through the use of the Learning Arc. Teachers will be implementing benchmarks with fidelity and supporting their lessons utilizing the resources provided by the district. SRA Corrective Reading will be implemented during Power Hour.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Progress monitoring will show a minimum of +10% proficiency increase for each grade in K-2, as well as 10% of the student just below the proficiency line becoming proficient.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Progress monitoring will show a minimum of +10% proficiency increase for each grade in 3rd-5th, as well as 10% of the student just below the proficiency line becoming proficient.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Progress monitoring toward our goals will be monitored using the district standardized walkthrough tool and progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Taveras, Marlene, marlene.taveras@polk-fl.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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. §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?

Reading Mastery for K-2 will be implemented and Corrective Reading for 3rd-5th grade will continue to be implemented. Phonics to Reading (K-2) as prescribed through district level implementation protocols will also be used as a resource.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The district selected this program based on its effectiveness. According to the What Works Clearinghouse, Corrective Reading was found to have potentially positive effects on alphabetics and fluency. Within the study the impact was analyzed for white and black students, economically disadvantaged students, male and female students.

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
Create master schedule to include collaborative planning time.	Taveras, Marlene, marlene.taveras@polk-fl.net
Review planning findings with leadership team on a regular basis to check progress and fidelity.	Taveras, Marlene, marlene.taveras@polk-fl.net
Monitor implementation of resources: Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, and Phonics to Reading.	Taveras, Marlene, marlene.taveras@polk-fl.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP will be shared with all staff member during preplanning week and will continue to be at the forefront of our work throughout the year. The SIP will be shared with students, families and other stakeholders during open house. The SIP and progress will be discussed during staff meetings and during SAC committee meetings.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other stakeholders by scheduling various family nights. Through title one we will have an open house, a K-2 family academic night and a 3-5 family academic night. Through the Community Partnership School, we will have monthly family nights focus on different activities that engage parents, students and the community. The school's website where the Family Engagement Plan will be made available is https://cle.polkschoolsfl.com/

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Teachers will use the learning arc framework during planning.
Paraeducators will be hired, and professional development will be provided to them in the academic programs that will be implemented at the school (corrective reading and number worlds).
Also, through the Community Partnership School, students will be provided the opportunity to participate in before school, during school and afterschool activities that strengthen the academic and behavior

programs at the school. We will combine rigorous academic programs and a wide-range of in-school services, supports and opportunities to promote children's learning and development.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

School Improvement Planning Trainings were provided by the district and state and Title I Technical Assistance – Use of Funds, PFE Input, Back to School training was provided by district.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				$182,450.79
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	130	0101 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$57,856.92
			Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - School based Reading Interventionist who works with small groups of students in need of remediation.			
	5100	210	0101 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		$7,851.18
			Notes: Retirement - 13.57% - Instructional Personnel -			
	5100	220	0101 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		$4,426.05
			Notes: Social Security -7.65% -Instructional personnel			
	5100	231	0101 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		$11,028.00
			Notes: Health and Hospitalization - Instructional Personnel			
	5100	232	0101 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		$21.60
			Notes: Life Insurance - Instructional personnel			
	5100	240	0101 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		$324.00
			Notes: Workers Compensation - .56% - Instructional Personnel			
	6400	130	0101 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$54,277.30
			Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - School-based Literacy Coach who co-teach, coach, and assist with the instruction of students in classrooms.			
	6400	210	0101 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		$9,270.77
			Notes: Retirement - 13.57% -Coaches - School based /School paid			

	6400	220	0101 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,226.34
			Notes: Social Security - 7.65% staff development activities for instructional staff at the school			
	6400	231	0101 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		$13,233.60
			Notes: Health and Hospitalization - School-based Coach - Literacy			
	6400	232	0101 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		$25.92
			Notes: Life Insurance - Coaches - School-based			
	6400	240	0101 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		$382.58
			Notes: Workers Compensation .56% - School-based Coach - Literacy			
	5100	510	0101 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	UniSIG		$4,887.18
			Notes: Supplies - Instructional (pens, pencils, paper, notebooks, folders, staplers, ink)			
	6400	160	0101 - Crystal Lake Elementary School	UniSIG	0.2	$13,639.35
			Notes: Cost sharing- Senior Coordinator of Instruction - individual will support multiple schools focusing on student learning by providing support and assistance to teachers and school-based administration. Provides extensive support and coaching services related to content-area instruction.			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				$0.00
					Total:	$182,450.79

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No