Crestwood Community Middle

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Crestwood Community Middle

64 SPARROW DR, Royal Palm Beach, FL 33411

https://cstm.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Stephanie Nance

Start Date for this Principal: 6/18/2007

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2018-19 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: B (61%)
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	TS&I
* 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 Palm Beach 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

Crestwood Community Middle

64 SPARROW DR, Royal Palm Beach, FL 33411

https://cstm.palmbeachschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	69%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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.

Crestwood Middle School is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Crestwood Middle School envisions a dynamic collaborative multi-cultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

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
Nance, Stephanie	Principal	Principal : Oversee all aspects of operational and instructional processes, people, and technology. The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making to ensure a sound, effective academic program is in place and there is a process to address and monitor the academic progress of all students.
Hutchins, lisa	Teacher, K-12	Provide individual, group and classroom counseling for students; serve as liaisons to community, county, state and federal agencies and programs; assist students and parents with course selection and scheduling; provide career, vocational, academic and attendance support to students.
Pasquariello, Martin	Assistant Principal	Provide insight/input on academic achievement, discipline data, and work as liaisons with classroom teachers. Assistant Principals each are designated liaisons to certain departments to maintain a close connection to the curriculum and making process of the specified department(s). Additionally, Principal/Assistant Principals attend designated Common Planning meetings to provide insight and leadership for curriculum decisions.
Kaliser, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Provide insight/input on academic achievement, discipline data, and work as liaisons with classroom teachers. Assistant Principals each are designated liaisons to certain departments to maintain a close connection to the curriculum and making process of the specified department(s). Additionally, Principal/Assistant Principals attend designated Common Planning meetings to provide insight and leadership for curriculum decisions.
Jolly, Amanda	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Coordinator supports and monitors the progress of all ESE students and collaborates closely with the RTi facilitator to monitor students in the tier process. The ESE Coordinator participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitate development of intervention plans; provide support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provide professional development and technical evaluation; facilitate data-based decision making activities.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	323	287	235	0	0	0	0	845
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	26	33	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	56	47	0	0	0	0	176
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	72	68	0	0	0	0	211
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	99	67	0	0	0	0	247

Grade Level column group spans K through 12.

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
								Grade Level						
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	74	58	0	0	0	0	201

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
								Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	33	22	0	0	0	0	85
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

73

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/30/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
								Grade Level						
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	6	27	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	32	47	0	0	0	0	136
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	36	45	0	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	78	80	75	0	0	0	0	0	233

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
								Grade Level						
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	43	46	0	0	0	0	143

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
								Grade Level						
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	6	27	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	32	47	0	0	0	0	136
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	36	45	0	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	78	80	75	0	0	0	0	0	233

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	54	43	46	0	0	0	0	143

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	53%	58%	54%	49%	56%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	56%	54%	53%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	49%	47%	44%	48%	44%
Math Achievement	64%	62%	58%	54%	61%	56%
Math Learning Gains	58%	60%	57%	55%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	53%	51%	44%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	46%	52%	51%	54%	53%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	69%	75%	72%	75%	76%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	323 (0)	287 (0)	235 (0)	845 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	35 (11)	26 (6)	33 (27)	94 (44)
One or more suspensions	73 (57)	56 (32)	47 (47)	176 (136)
Course failure in ELA or Math	71 (55)	72 (36)	68 (45)	211 (136)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	81 (80)	99 (75)	67 (0)	247 (155)

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	54%	58%	-4%	54%	0%
	2018	54%	53%	1%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	48%	53%	-5%	52%	-4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	42%	54%	-12%	51%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2019	53%	58%	-5%	56%	-3%
	2018	54%	60%	-6%	58%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	56%	60%	-4%	55%	1%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	39%	35%	4%	54%	-15%
	2018	42%	39%	3%	54%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
08	2019	73%	64%	9%	46%	27%
	2018	59%	65%	-6%	45%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		31%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	46%	51%	-5%	48%	-2%
	2018	46%	54%	-8%	50%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	66%	72%	-6%	71%	-5%
2018	64%	72%	-8%	71%	-7%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		2%			

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	99%	64%	35%	61%	38%
2018	95%	62%	33%	62%	33%
Compare		4%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	60%	40%	57%	43%
2018	100%	57%	43%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	23	34	27	35	45	28	28	44	50		
ELL	40	44	33	48	39	24	24	35			
ASN	76	53		71	71						
BLK	47	47	38	58	55	39	40	67	79		
HSP	55	41	27	61	54	38	45	59	67		
MUL	53	51	46	67	63		29	85	91		
WHT	59	55	46	74	66	41	58	76	71		
FRL	47	44	38	58	56	42	39	62	73		
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	16	40	41	29	55	55	13	36	60		
ELL	26	50	46	35	48	55		33			
ASN	81	81		86	71				80		
BLK	42	44	35	45	52	51	27	65	77		
HSP	53	47	47	56	57	68	51	69	68		
MUL	55	54		64	62	50	50	67			
WHT	60	55	55	74	66	72	62	60	74		

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
FRL	47	47	42	53	56	57	38	61	72		
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	13	34	32	20	40	33	19	33			
ELL	11	42	41	23	42	39					
ASN	70	48		74	61		90		80		
BLK	39	51	45	39	48	43	39	68	63		
HSP	50	50	39	53	53	45	45	76	65		
MUL	58	50		61	43	40	84	87	75		
WHT	57	61	53	69	67	50	65	80	83		
FRL	44	49	40	47	52	41	45	70	63		

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	525
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	36
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%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	68
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
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.

Our Lowest 25% in ELA (36%) and Lowest 25% in Math (40%) were the lowest performance components for FY19. The performance trend from the previous two years, FY16 and FY17, showed an increase in scores for these two categories. The contributing factors to last years decline in performance..

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

Our largest data component decline from the previous year occurred within our student subgroups of Students with Disabilities and English Learners and within the data component of the Lowest 25% in ELA and Lowest 25% in Math. SWD dropped 14 percentage points from 41 to 27 in FY19 ELA and dropped 27 percentage points from 55 to 28 in FY19 Math. ELL students dropped 13 percentage points from 46 to 33 in FY19 ELA and dropped 31 percentage points from 55 to 24 in FY19 Math. The factors that contributed to this decline are:
The need for increased targeted and focused standards based Language Arts instruction.
Mater Board Configuration- Decrease the number of sections that strategist are scheduled to work with students and increase the time spent with students in the in the sections assigned.
The need for the staffing of certified teachers in all grade levels to ensure the highest quality middle school experience in 6th 7th and 8th grades.
The need for increased targeted and focused standards based math instruction during tutorials.
Mater Board Configuration- Decrease the number of sections that strategist are scheduled to work with students and increase the time spent with students in the in the sections assigned.
The need for the staffing of certified teachers in all grade levels to ensure the highest quality middle school experience in 6th 7th and 8th grades.

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.

Our Lowest 25% in ELA and Lowest 25% in Math revealed our greatest gap when compared to the state average. In ELA, 36% of our Lowest 25% finished with a level 3 or higher compared to the state score of 47%. In Math, 40% of our Lowest 25% finished with a level 3 or higher compared to the state score of 51%. The factors that contributed to these trends are: The need for increased targeted and focused standards based Language Arts instruction.
Mater Board Configuration- Decrease the number of sections that strategist are scheduled to work with students and increase the time spent with students in the in the sections assigned.
The need for the staffing of certified teachers in all grade levels to ensure the highest quality middle school experience in 6th 7th and 8th grades.
The need for increased targeted and focused standards based math instruction during tutorials.
Mater Board Configuration- Decrease the number of sections that strategist are scheduled to work with students and increase the time spent with students in the in the sections assigned.
The need for the staffing of certified teachers in all grade levels to ensure the highest quality middle school experience in 6th 7th and 8th grades.

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

Both ELA and Math achievement scores demonstrated our largest improvement from the previous year.
Content area teams meet regularly during PLC's to plan for students.
Professional Development for ELA and Math teachers.
Teachers administered FSQ's and USA's to assess student performance on standards followed by adjustments to instruction according to the areas of demonstrated need.
Teacher leaders supported content area teams during planning and collaboration.

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

The count of students with less than 90% attendance shows a sharp increase starting in FY17 with 12, FY18 with 44 and FY 19 with 94. After reviewing the same data component of other schools across the district, their data also shows sharp increases in absenteeism. We may conclude that either there has been a sharp increase in the absenteeism across the district, new Student Information System data collection and/or input is faulty or the Student Data System is correctly capturing this data component. We can not consider this a trend at this time until we have additional data to support that a trend is occurring on a more continued basis.
Our overall average over the last 4 years shows a trend of the decrease in level one students on state wide assessments. Our goal is to continue to reduce the number of Level 1 students.
Continue to provide these students with the services they need and support to ensure that they make a year's growth in a years time or better. Another goal, is always to reduce the number of suspensions through education and school-wide positive behavior.

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

1. Increase the Lowest 25% in ELA
2. Increase the Lowest 25% in Math
3. Reduce Absenteeism
4. Reduce Suspension Rates
5. Increase identification of students who have signs of academic and behavioral concerns, develop plans of action and follow through with plans of action for increased student health and well being.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	To ensure the progress of our Lowest 25th percentile in ELA and Math learning gains in alignment with the District's Strategic Plan to ensure High School Readiness.
Rationale	Our Lowest 25% in ELA (36%) and Lowest 25% in Math (40%) were the lowest performance components for FY19

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our Lowest 25% in ELA will increase by 9% for a total of 45% and our Lowest 25% in Math will increase by 9% for a total of 49% for FY20
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephanie Nance (stephanie.nance@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Through Crestwood Middle Schools Professional Learning Communities, teachers will engage in deep, focused professional development, collaborative planning and data analysis to strengthen standards-based instruction (Kaliser, Pasquariello). 2. Identify PGP element (Tracking Progress) for Deliberate Practice portion of the Focused Model of Instruction (Kaliser, Pasquariello). 3. Based on the results of the FY19 School Effectiveness Questionnaire, staff will engage in social emotional learning training to learn strategies in building positive relationships with students (Kaliser, Pasquariello).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	1. Developing teachers' instructional expertise through strategic professional learning in PLCs will help accelerate student learning to meet grade level proficiency. 2. By identifying strengths, growth areas, and concrete, actionable goals teachers and administrators will gain a clearer sense of where they are and what must be done to continue to grow and develop as educators. 3. By incorporating social and emotional learning practices throughout the school, staff will be able to proactively address students' social emotional needs.

Action Step	
Description	1. The PD/PLCs will be focused on data analysis and effective instruction based on the needs. a.During the PLCs, teachers will work collaboratively to plan and develop lessons focused on best practices and strategies aligned to the standards. b. Professional learning will be developed to support teacher capacity and instructional needs and include building expertise in using the online learning tools c. Monitoring of PD/PLCs will take place through data analysis/ student progress, attendance, PD on instructional strategies with fidelity (classroom walks) and review of lesson plans. 2. Administration will conduct PGP data chats with teachers to formulate their action plans, monitor progress of plans and determine impact on their instructional practices. 3. Staff will participate in School-wide Positive Behavior Support training to learn how to cultivate and engage in positive relations with peers, staff, and parents. a. Teachers will be trained in Kognito to recognize warning signs, initiate conversations and refer students to the appropriate social emotional learning services.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Nance (stephanie.nance@palmbeachschools.org)

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).

In alignment with the District's Strategic Plan and with the goal to increase the academic instruction of all students- Students are immersed in rigorous task encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a Single School Culture of excellence in Academic, Behavior, and Climate with an appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 with a focus on the instruction of the
*History of the Holocaust
*History of African Americans,
*Study of the Contributions of Hispanics
*Study of the Contributions of Women to the US, and
*Sacrifices of Veterans in Serving our Country
Within our school, teachers will articulate, demonstrate, and teach the specific practices the reflect the application of the school's SwPBS universal guidelines of students practicing being responsible, respectful and ready to learn. Adults across the campus will clarify their expectations for positive interpersonal interaction and create structure for a single school culture of excellence.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

At Crestwood we believe that community commitment increases student achievement, reduces absenteeism, and instills confidence in a student's education. When families, communities and schools work together, students are more successful. Parent engagement at Crestwood is a shared responsibility in which we and the community are committed to by actively supporting our students learning and development. The following is a listing of events here at Crestwood that our parents and community are involved with on an annual basis:
Crestival Fun Fair
6th 7th 8th Open House
Dads Take Your Child to School Day
Choice Open House
Eagle Curriculum Night
6th grade Orientation
ESE Breakfast
ESOL Breakfast
Pasta Dinner Night

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

For FY20, CMS will have hired an additional guidance counselor and one mental health behavior health professional to add to the existing two-person school counselor team. Crestwood ensures an operational school based team that meets weekly to discuss students with barriers to academic and social success provides mentors assignments to students identified with SEL concerns, and provides Instruction and various campus activities that address social/emotional needs of students.

The SBT will connect students to agencies who have Cooperative Agreements or are on campus (DATA, YSB, CHS, Care- Giving Youth, etc).

Guidance Counselors will develop and implement a comprehensive school counseling program (Student Development Plan) with dedicated time to: (1) Assess the needs of the students and the barriers blocking their success (Data-Driven Decision Making), (2) Identify interventions that the research suggests works to remove the barrier to success (Evidence-Based Intervention), and (3) Evaluate your intervention and the outcomes (Evaluation)

Administration will engage with identified staff (i.e. school counselor, school-based team leader) to provide a differentiated delivery of services based on student/school need. Include core (classroom guidance, workshop, assembly), supplemental (solution focused small group counseling), and intensive supports (individual counseling/advisement, referral to community resources). Utilize data-based decision making to close academic, social-emotional and college-career equity gaps by connecting all students with the services they need.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

School personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance. Crestwood staff work closely with the feeder pattern of schools who transition into Crestwood to provide a supportive and welcoming environment to all incoming students.

Crestwood staff provide opportunities prior to the start of the school year for parents and students to meet the staff, spend time on the campus and receive information about programs and services available at the school.

All members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule. Collaboration occurs across grade levels, content areas, and feeder schools. Staff members implement a formal process that promotes productive discussion about student learning.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The School Leadership team works collaboratively throughout the year to complete shared decision making. The team meets weekly to review the progress of students and any school wide needs which need to be addressed. The team reviews any funding decisions and makes a collaborative decision about how funds can be used to support the learning of each student.

The Crestwood Middle School Master Board was created based on data collected on student need. Classes are created and placed on our board based on student need. Struggling students are identified through the SBT and RTI processes. Student needs are identified and interventions are administered

based on the identified needs. Programs that may be utilized to meet student needs may include:
Talons Before and After School Program-Afternoon and morning enrichment and tutorial, Director, Ms. Daniels
Compass, Course Credit Recovery- students who have failed a course have the opportunity to redo coursework and retake a course through alternate means and earn academic credit, Director, Mr. Raos
AVID-trains educators to use proven practices to prepare students for success in high school, college, and a career, especially students traditionally underrepresented in higher education, Director, Ms. Cress

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Crestwood Middle Schools AVID program helps students to develop learning, study and academic behavioral skills that are essential to success in rigorous coursework. It acts as a catalyst for the developing a culture of college readiness for all students across the campus. In the AVID Elective class, students receive daily instruction and support to prepare them for college from a trained AVID Elective teacher. AVID impacts students school wide as academic strategies like writing to learn, inquiry, collaboration, organizational skills, and critical reading (WICOR) are taught in all classes by teachers who have been trained to use AVID strategies in their specific content areas.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To ensure the progress of our Lowest 25th percentile in ELA and Math learning gains in alignment with the District's Strategic Plan to ensure High School Readiness.				$2,899.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			1691 - Crestwood Community Middle	School Improvement Funds		$2,899.00
		Notes: Funds will spent per SAC approval				
					Total:	$2,899.00