Crestwood Community Middle

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners 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%)
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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	70%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/18/2007, Stephanie Nance

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

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
23

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
46

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners 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%)
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](#).	

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	262	269	268	0	0	0	0	799
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	29	31	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	59	48	0	0	0	0	154
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	36	52	0	0	0	0	149
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	42	50	0	0	0	0	147
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	41	45	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	47	54	0	0	0	0	124
FY20 ELA Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	129	133	0	0	0	0	376
FY20 Math Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	105	67	0	0	0	0	289

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	50	43	50	0	0	0	0	143

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	28	32	20	0	0	0	0	80
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

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	69	74	58	0	0	0	0	201

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	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	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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

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	69	74	58	0	0	0	0	201

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	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	

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**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
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%
	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%
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		

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
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		
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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
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%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	68
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

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, FY18 and FY19, showed an increase in scores for these two categories. The contributing factors to last years decline in performance. was due to our high turnover rate of teachers in ELA. When comparing FY19 FSA scores in ELA to FY20 Diagnostic scores, for all students who scored proficient, CMS students we went from 52% to 52% which is an increase of 0%. However, when looking at subgroups, such as Hispanic Female, ELL Female and Female Students with disabilities we saw a decrease in proficiency. Hispanic Female students who were 59% proficient fell to 48% which is a decrease of 11%. ELL female students who were 32% proficient fell to 22% which is a decrease of 10%. Students with Disabilities who were 26% proficient fell to 20% which is a decrease of 6%.
When comparing FY19 FSA scores in Math to FY20 Diagnostic scores, for all students who scored proficient, we went from 58% to 53% which is a decrease of 5%. When looking at subgroups we saw decreases in proficiency in Black Female students who were 59% proficient fell to 54% which is a decrease of 5%. Black Male students who were 51% proficient fell to 40% which is a decrease of 11%.

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. Math L25 students went from 58% to 40 %. SWD dropped 14 percentage points from 41 to 27 in FY20 ELA and dropped 27 percentage points from 55 to 28 in FY20 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.
When comparing FY19 FSA scores in ELA to FY20 Diagnostic scores, for all students who scored proficient, CMS students we went from 52% to 52% which is an increase of 0%. However, when looking at subgroups, we saw a decrease in proficiency. Hispanic Female students who were 59% proficient fell to 48% which is a decrease of 11%. ELL female students who were 32% proficient fell to 22% which is a decrease of 10%. Students with Disabilities who were 26% proficient fell to 20% which is a decrease of 6%.

- The need for increased targeted and focused standards based Language Arts instruction.
- Master 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.

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.
- Master 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.
- Master 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. Math achievement increased 5% and ELA achievement increased 4%.
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?

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.

We have met with district support and reviewed our school wide truancy plan. Our plan will include: Weekly parent contact, SBT meeting (mandatory after 15th occurrence), conference with parent, student, teacher and administration, mentor support, counseling referral and home visits. 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.

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

1. ELA learning for L 25%
2. Math learning gains for L 25%
3. ELA learning gains
4. Science achievement
5. Math learning gains

Standards Based Instruction will continue to be a primary focus during instruction planning sessions, professional learning communities and data chats with teachers and students. Resources and strategies will be aligned to grade level standards and scaffolds will be put in place to support students who are not yet performing at their grade level. Our tutorial program will identify and address the individual needs of students who are not yet proficient and prepare them to reach proficiency and success.

Teachers will incorporate effective and relevant instruction to meet the needs of all students then we will ensure high school readiness. Teachers utilize a variety of teaching strategies in which they have been previously trained and will continue to engage in job embedded professional learning opportunities throughout the school year as monitored via instructional planning, teacher observations, teacher data chats, analysis of student data and common planning by departments.

More specifically, CMS will employ the RACE is a strategy to help students answer questions and cite evidence from the text or document. This strategy gives students framework for responding to questions. Students will support their answer with information from the text and extend their answer by backing up information from the text with their prior knowledge about the topic.

CMS will also employ a school-wide reading standard to be addressed in all courses. It is a program of infusing basic strategies in embedded reading standards in all content area courses. The academic vocabulary includes words used in academic dialogue and texts. Academic vocabulary words help students understand oral directions and classroom instructions as well as comprehend text across different subject areas."

Our focus is to increase student engagement so students become active learners in their own academic journey as they learn by doing and putting strategies into practice. It is our hope that students take ownership and foster independence through their engagement in their daily lessons.

This focus will be ongoing and PD will be provided during staff meetings and on professional development days.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: To ensure the progress of our Lowest 25th percentile in ELA learning gains in alignment with the District's Strategic Plan to ensure High School Readiness. Rationale: Our Lowest 25% in ELA (36%) were the lowest performance components for FY19.
Measurable Outcome:	Our Lowest 25% in ELA learning gains will increase by 9% for a total of 45% for FY21.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Nance (stephanie.nance@palmbeachschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. The implementation of a school-wide literacy initiative targeting specific reading and writing standards and training teachers on the use of literacy-based strategies to infuse or embed reading standards in content area courses. 2. 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). 3. Identify PGP element (Tracking Progress) for Deliberate Practice portion of the Focused Model of Instruction (Kaliser, Pasquariello). 4. 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. By building teachers' capacity in infusing literacy-based strategies into direct instruction of academic language will provide students with the necessary language to communicate within the discipline they are learning. 2. Developing teachers' instructional expertise through strategic professional learning in PLCs will help accelerate student learning to meet grade level proficiency. 3. 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. 4. By incorporating social and emotional learning practices throughout the school, staff will be able to proactively address students' social emotional needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The literacy PD will target literacy-based and writing strategies that teacher can embed within their content.
2. The 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 PLCs will take place through data analysis/ student progress, attendance, PD on instructional strategies with fidelity (classroom walks) and review of lesson plans.
3. Administration will conduct PGP data chats with teachers to formulate their action plans, monitor progress of plans and determine impact on their instructional practices.
4. Staff will participate in School-wide Positive Behavior Support training to learn how to cultivate and engage in positive relations with peers.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: To ensure the progress of our Lowest 25th percentile in Math learning gains in alignment with the District's Strategic Plan to ensure High School Readiness. Rationale: Our Lowest 25% in Math (40%) were the lowest performance components for FY19.
Measurable Outcome:	Our Lowest 25% in Math learning gains will increase by 9% for a total of 49% for FY21.
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). 4. Through the implementation of an adaptive technology tool to identify students' weaknesses to provide targeted intensive instruction for Low 25% student group.
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. 4. Building teacher capacity in how to infuse the adaptive technology tool to tailor targeted students academic instruction and monitor student progress.

Action Steps to Implement

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.
4. Teachers will be trained in IXL in how to utilize as a diagnostic tool, use to individualize academic instruction and monitor student progress.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Pillars of Effective Instruction: 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 and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 with a focus on reading and writing across all content areas. Our students focus on content and curriculum related to:

The History of the Holocaust
The History of Black and African Americans
The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics
The Contributions of Women
The Sacrifices of Veterans and Medal of Honor recipients within US History.

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols, and monitoring SwPBS through data. In alignment, to school board 2.09 and Florida State statue 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, art expos of different cultures and in music our students study music of different eras and countries and in media our library selection is filled with books related to the variety of cultures.

We update action plans during monthly PBS meetings. We instill appreciation for multicultural diversity though our anti-bullying campaign, structured lessons, and PBS implementation. Additionally, our plan for supporting students through Social Emotional Learning strategies is discussed, and monitored during monthly meetings. Teachers follow a research based SEL curriculum to support students beyond academics.

Federal and local funded services are coordinated based on the needs of students. Title 1 funds are used to provide supplemental educational services for students through supplemental research based programs, three additional teachers, academic tutors, student materials, and additional technology. Funding is also used to meet the needs of our families through the Literacy, Math and FSA nights.

Social Emotional Learning skills are explicitly taught to all students to help them develop self-awareness, self-regulation, social awareness, and responsible decision making skills. These cognitive, effective and behavioral competencies have a great impact in student performance and have long lasting positive effects beyond school. According to the Collaborative for Social Emotional Learning (CASEL), " SEL interventions that address CASEL's five core competencies increased students' academic performance by 11 percentile points, compared to students who did not participate in such SEL programs. Students participating in SEL programs also showed improved classroom behavior, an increased ability to manage stress and depression, and better attitudes about themselves, others, and school" (Casel.org/impact).

Teachers and administrators are using electronic Data Tracking forms in all grade levels (K through 5th) to ensure students specific data includes District, State, and teacher created benchmark assessments. Administrators and teachers meet periodically to conduct data chats with the purpose to monitor student progress, discuss teacher support, and additional possible actions, or referrals needed to SBT as well as other resources. Additionally, our Dual Language teachers are provided the time to discuss students progress in each language and how to interpret the data with Dual Language Specialist and Dual Language coach. Through Professional Learning Community meetings, each grade level analyzes grade level and teacher data on common assessments using the FCIM. Teachers share resources, discuss reteaching, tutorial needs and also professional development needs are determined.

Local feeder elementary schools are invited to bring their students to visit our 6th grade classes every spring. Staff and teachers go over the curriculum and instructional programs in place.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Single School Culture and appreciation for multicultural diversity, in the appropriate areas, as required by School Board Policy 2.09 is at the heart of Crestwood. Crestwood addresses the three parts of Single School Culture, Academics, Behavior, and Climate throughout the school year. Single School Culture is the district's belief system and practices regarding academics, behavior, and climate.

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols, and monitoring SwPBS through data. In alignment, to school board 2.09 and Florida State statue 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, art expos of different cultures and in music our students study music of different eras and countries and in media our library selection is filled with books related to the variety of cultures.

We update action plans during monthly PBS meetings. We instill appreciation for multicultural diversity though our anti-bullying campaign, structured lessons, and PBS implementation. Additionally, our plan for supporting students through Social Emotional Learning strategies is discussed, and monitored during monthly meetings. Teachers follow a research based SEL curriculum to support students beyond academics.

Social Emotional Learning skills are explicitly taught to all students to help them develop self-awareness, self-regulation, social awareness, and responsible decision making skills. These cognitive, affective and behavioral competencies have a great impact in student performance and have long lasting positive effects beyond school. According to the Collaborative for Social Emotional Learning (CASEL), " SEL interventions that address CASEL's five core competencies increased students' academic performance by 11 percentile points, compared to students who did not participate in such SEL programs. Students participating in SEL programs also showed improved classroom behavior, an increased ability to manage stress and depression, and better attitudes about themselves, others, and school" (Casel.org/impact).

Teachers and administrators are using electronic Data Tracking forms in all grade levels (K through 5th) to ensure students specific data includes District, State, and teacher created benchmark assessments. Administrators and teachers meet periodically to conduct data chats with the purpose to monitor student progress, discuss teacher support, and additional possible actions, or referrals needed to SBT as well as other resources. Additionally, our Dual Language teachers are provided the time to discuss students progress in each language and how to interpret the data with Dual Language Specialist and Dual Language coach. Through Professional Learning Community meetings, each grade level analyzes grade level and teacher data on common assessments using the FCIM. Teachers share resources, discuss reteaching, tutorial needs and also professional development needs are determined.

Fifth grade students receive information about Middle School Choice programs at our school. Our school conducts an annual choice night for neighboring feeder schools in October. During this event, fifth grade students and parents have an opportunity to learn more about each choice program, its requirements and meet the instructors.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$875.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	1691 - Crestwood Community Middle	School Improvement Funds		$875.00
			Notes: Funds will be spent per SAC approval.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$0.00
					Total:	$875.00