

Pasco County Schools

# Crews Lake Middle School.



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Crews Lake Middle School.

15144 SHADY HILLS RD, Spring Hill, FL 34610

<https://clms.pasco.k12.fl.us>

### Demographics

**Principal: Paul Lipinski**

Start Date for this Principal: 2/20/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (48%) 2014-15: C (51%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Crews Lake Middle School.

15144 SHADY HILLS RD, Spring Hill, FL 34610

<https://clms.pasco.k12.fl.us>

### School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	74%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

### School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.**

CLMS will provide a safe, caring, supportive, and rigorous learning environment to ensure ALL students are engaged and successful learners.

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

Our Vision:  
CLMS is a learning focused school community that strives to engage in continuous improvement.

Core Values:  
All Raiders commit to an “All Hands On Deck” approach to ensure that our actions and initiatives are aligned to promote:

- Learning
- Relationships
- Collaboration
- Growth Mindset
- Engagement
- Wellness

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Huyck, David	Principal	Facilitator and monitoring of school improvement goals and student achievement data.
Aunchman, Terry	Assistant Principal	
Choo, Jackie	Assistant Principal	
	Instructional Coach	

### 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	71	74	0	0	0	0	218
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	11	0	0	0	0	25

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

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

**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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

30

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 9/5/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

## 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	48%	52%	54%	46%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	55%	54%	50%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	47%	47%	39%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	61%	60%	58%	51%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	62%	61%	57%	56%	58%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	51%	42%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	43%	52%	51%	51%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	59%	68%	72%	68%	70%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	73 (0)	71 (0)	74 (0)	218 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 ( )	4 ( )	0 ( )	9 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ( )	0 ( )	7 ( )	7 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 ( )	3 ( )	5 ( )	10 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	10 ( )	4 ( )	11 ( )	25 (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.

NOTE: 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
06	2019	51%	56%	-5%	54%	-3%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	39%	51%	-12%	52%	-13%
	2018	43%	51%	-8%	51%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	50%	58%	-8%	56%	-6%
	2018	46%	58%	-12%	58%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	55%	59%	-4%	55%	0%
	2018	44%	53%	-9%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	45%	42%	3%	54%	-9%
	2018	47%	44%	3%	54%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	67%	68%	-1%	46%	21%
	2018	50%	63%	-13%	45%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	42%	54%	-12%	48%	-6%
	2018	39%	53%	-14%	50%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	70%	-10%	71%	-11%
2018	64%	71%	-7%	71%	-7%
Compare		-4%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	60%	40%	61%	39%
2018	96%	63%	33%	62%	34%
Compare		4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%

**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	21	45	44	29	48	43	20	21			
ELL	8	47	70	17	47						
BLK	30	31		45	66	50	17	62			
HSP	44	53	48	52	52	61	36	54	56		
MUL	52	58	30	50	45	20	23				
WHT	49	55	44	64	65	53	47	61	45		
FRL	42	50	41	57	58	50	39	55	41		
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	15	36	32	18	33	32	29	40			
ELL	33	31		25	50						
BLK	24	38		35	41		27	40			
HSP	41	45	48	54	50	35	38	72	40		
MUL	33	41	27	50	43			50			
WHT	45	44	32	53	56	50	41	67	48		
FRL	39	42	33	48	50	42	35	63	41		

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	16	43	40	20	43	34	21	36	10		
ELL	40	45		30	46						
BLK	23	29	20	27	43	27	18				
HSP	48	46	28	54	58	50	44	59	56		
MUL	56	56		40	48						
WHT	46	51	41	52	57	43	54	68	52		
FRL	41	47	37	46	52	41	46	63	53		

**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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	9
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

**English Language Learners**

Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

**Native American Students**

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## 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.**

Data in English Language Arts showed the greatest disparity between school performance and state performance. 6th, 7th and 8th Grade ELA performed 15%, 13%, and 12% below the state average, respectively. SWD and ELL performance also scored significantly below their non-disabled peers. on average. Performance in this area was likely impacted by a vacancy in in ELA for a portion of the year in 7th grade (the lowest performing grade level in ELA). In addition, CLMS was in it's first year of implementing Tier 3 supports for students performing significantly below grade level. However, all grade level averages in ELA did improve from the the previous year. Trends indicate that students are able to demonstrate skill knowledge to familiar tasks, but are struggling with applying these skills on "cold read" tasks when confronted with text that is complex, and for which they are seeing for the first time.

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

Both 7th Grade ELA and Civics performance dropped 4 % points from the previous year (from 64% to 60% proficient). 7th grade Math declined by 2% points. All other data areas saw an increase over previous years performance.

**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.**

Data in English Language Arts showed the greatest disparity between school performance and state performance. 6th, 7th and 8th Grade ELA performed 15%, 13%, and 12% below the state average, respectively.

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

Mathematics performance, particularly 6th and 8th grades, showed the greatest improvement over the previous year. 6th grade math students improved by 11% points over the previous year. 7th grade math declined by 2% points. 8th grade math students improved by 17% points. We added a Math Coach during the previous year so we believe that this support has contributed to our over all improvement with this additional support for teachers in place.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

EWS data reflects problems areas related to attendance and multiple failures for some students.

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

1. Tier One Attendance and Engagement.
2. Implement Trauma Informed Care principles.
3. Improved instruction and assessment using "Thinking Maps."
4. Teachers and PLC Teams will design and implement effective Tier 1 instruction using Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles that reflect the intent and rigor of the standards.
5. Social Emotional Learning (SEL)

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1

<b>Title</b>	Data Driven Decisions
<b>Rationale</b>	CLMS PLC Teams implement Thinking Maps as a visual instructional and assessment tool.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>Goal 1: CLMS will achieve at least 55% proficiency in Math, ELA/Reading, Science, and Social Studies as measured by the end of the 2019-20 school year summative assessment.</p> <p>Goal 2: CLMS will achieve at least 60% learning gains in Math and ELA/Reading as measured by the end of the 2019-20 school year summative assessment.</p> <p>Goal 3: SWD and ELL students will achieve at least 40% learning gains in ELA and Math as measured by the end of the 2019-20 school year summative assessment.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Terry Aunchman (taunchma@pasco.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Train the trainer PD for teacher facilitators</li> <li>2. Provide training to teachers on the use of Thinking Maps.</li> <li>3. Provide PD and coaching in the use of "Monitoring for Learning" strategies with in-class modeling for teachers.</li> </ol>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Thinking maps are consistent visual patterns linked directly to eight specific thought processes. By visualizing our thinking, we create concrete images of abstract thoughts. These patterns help all students reach higher levels of critical and creative thinking-- essential components of a 21st century education.
<b>Action Step</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PLC Teams will implement Thinking Maps in all content areas;</li> </ol> <p>~As a visual learning tool to improve the effectiveness of standards based instruction.</p> <p>~As a tool to monitor and assess student progress toward standards mastery.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Teachers and PLC teams will analyze student responses through the use of thinking maps and other formative assessment strategies, to respond to student learning.</li> <li>3. District collaboration and support to design effective and timely PD to support the above PD strategies/goals.</li> </ol>
<b>Description</b>	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	David Huyck (dhuyck@pasco.k12.fl.us)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	High Impact Instruction
<b>Rationale</b>	Teachers and PLC Teams will design and implement effective Tier 1 instruction using Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles that reflect the intent and rigor of the standards.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>Goal 1: CLMS will achieve at least 55% proficiency in Math, ELA/Reading, Science, and social studies as measured by the end of the 2019-20 school year summative assessment.</p> <p>Goal 2: CLMS will achieve at least 60% learning gains in Math and ELA/Reading as measured by the end of the 2019-20 school year summative assessment.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	David Huyck (dhuyck@pasco.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>-Teachers and PLC teams will implement and leverage UDL principles to plan for student variability within the PLC Cycle.</p> <p>-Teachers support, encourage, and provide immediate and specific feedback to students to promote student achievement. (FEAPs 1, 3 &amp; 4).</p> <p>-Teachers effectively deepen and enrich students' understanding through content area literacy strategies (FEAPs 1 &amp; 3).</p> <p>-Teachers effectively identify gaps in students' subject matter knowledge. (FEAPs 3 &amp; 4). Teachers effectively modify instruction to respond to preconceptions or misconceptions. (FEAPS 3).</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Universal Design for Learning (UDL) provides the opportunity for all students to access, participate in, and progress in the general-education curriculum by reducing barriers to instruction. Teachers will learn more about how UDL offers options for presenting information, how students respond or demonstrate their knowledge and skills, and how students are engaged in learning.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide PD and coaching to implement Basic Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles during planning, instruction, and assessment.</li> <li>2. Provide PD and coaching for developing and implementing purposeful questioning strategies/probes to monitor learning</li> <li>3. Provide PD and coaching in the use of "Monitoring for Learning" strategies with in-class modeling for teachers</li> <li>4. Provide PD and coaching in disciplinary literacy strategies in core content areas</li> <li>5. Provide PD and coaching on high leverage engagement strategies and effective feedback cycles.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	David Huyck (dhuyck@pasco.k12.fl.us)



<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Collaborative Culture
<b>Rationale</b>	School and teacher teams will engage in building awareness around the impact of trauma on learning and implement social emotional strategies to positively impact engagement and wellness for staff and students.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CLMS will increase staff and student engagement by 0.2 by the end of the 2019-20 school year.</li> <li>2. CLMS will decrease disciplinary referrals related to student/student and staff/student interactions by 15% by the end of the 2019-20 school year.</li> <li>3. CLMS will improve average daily attendance to at least 90% by the end of the 2019-20 school year.</li> </ol>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	[no one identified]
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide PD and support to deepen understanding and implementation of Trauma Aware principles.</li> <li>2. Provide PD related to principles and skills of Social Emotional Learning.</li> <li>3. Provide ongoing PD and support to teacher teams to deepen understanding of their role within a tiered response system.</li> </ol>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Research shows positive trends in the academic and behavioral growth of students in schools within districts with systematic SEL approaches. (Kendziora & Yoder, 2016). The Centers for Disease Control determined that trauma is the single largest crisis facing our nation. By investing in the social emotional health of our students and staff and creating a school-wide system for positive behavior supports aligned with structured classroom management, CLMS will create an environment that fosters positive relationships and structures that support academic achievement.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<p>For Goals 1-3 in Collaborative culture</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Build awareness and knowledge of Trauma Informed Care.</li> <li>2. Build awareness and knowledge of Social Emotional Learning.</li> <li>3. Develop school-wide culture survey given at least quarterly to monitor school culture and inform decision making</li> <li>4. Revisit mission, vision and collective commitments during retreat to focus and simplify language as driving force for teachers and students.</li> <li>5. Increase visibility and connection of school mission for all stakeholders</li> <li>6. Set recognition schedule at regular interval with monitoring</li> </ol> <p>For Goals 2 and 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Staff will engage in PBIS booster training</li> <li>2. Staff will engage in Trauma Informed Care Phase 2 training.</li> <li>3. Staff will engage in Social Emotional Learning PD.</li> <li>4. Student services team and PBIS committee will monitor data and make adjustment during the school year, as needed</li> <li>5. School Counselors will provide character education and social skills groups for students.</li> <li>6. School teams will engage in the MTSS process for identified students.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	David Huyck (dhuyck@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

N/A