

Pasco County Schools

Crews Lake Middle School.



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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: 9/24/2020

| | |
|--|---|
| 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) | 69% |
| 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (48%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| 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 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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

Crews Lake Middle School.

15144 SHADY HILLS RD, Spring Hill, FL 34610

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

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 | Yes | 64% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 28% |

School Grades History

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 9/24/2020, Paul Lipinski

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.*

15

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) | 69% |
| 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (48%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| 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 | 243 | 256 | 248 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 747 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 32 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 34 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 in ELA or math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 75 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194 | |
| Course failure in ELA or math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 49 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 | |

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 | 53 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 | |

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

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 | 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 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 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 | |
| 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 | 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 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 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 | |
| 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 | 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% |

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| 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 | |
| | (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 | 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% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 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 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| 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% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 43 |
| 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 | 40 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |

| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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.

Based on ELA FSA (17-18/18-19) SWD students did increase progress from 9% to 12% but the gap is still significant compared to non-disabled peers.

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

6th Grade performance in English Language Arts saw a decline from the 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.

CLMS performance areas that had the greatest gap when compared to the State average were in the areas of science and civics;

Science: school 43%, state: 51% (-9 point difference)

Civics: school 59%, state: 72% (-13 point difference)

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

We saw significant gains in the area of Math Achievement and Learning gains

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

Performance of SWD students still lags significantly behind non disabled peers.
FSA ELA 18-19 proficiency decreased from 20% to 11%

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

1. Improve performance of student with disabilities in all core content areas
2. Improve Science proficiency to within 5 points of state average
3. Improve Civics proficiency to within 5 points of state average
4. Increase learning gains for lowest 25%
5. Increase ELL proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement**Areas of Focus:****#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: High Impact Instruction

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the 2020-21 School Year, at least 60% of CLMS students will be minimally proficient in Math and Reading (ELA).
All subgroups, including the lowest quartile, will demonstrate at least 55% learning gains in math and reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Instructional PLC teams will implement UDL Guiding principles when planning, implementing, and assessing instruction for all content areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Universal Design for Learning principles are designed to improve learning outcomes for ALL students through consideration of learning variability and targeting instructional design elements with this variability in mind.

Action Steps to Implement

1. CAST Resources and potential PD Training through CAST.
2. Administrators currently in a UDL online course
3. CLMS teachers currently working on an online UDL primer course.
4. Launch at Summer Retreat

Person Responsible

David Huyck (dhuyck@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Collaborative Culture: CLMS will build off 2019-20 Social Emotional Learning (SEL) professional development and integrate SEL benchmarks in the SEL competency areas of self-awareness, social awareness, and responsible decision making. The PCS SEL Framework includes three overarching categories (domains), five broad areas of development (competencies), and 17 statements that capture the essential knowledge and skills that PCS has determined students need to be successful in school and life (standards). Each standard has 2–6 grade-band benchmarks

Measurable Outcome: Social Emotional Learning (SEL) is a n evidence based framework to assist students with skills in the domains of self-awareness, self-management, social-awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: The PCS SEL Framework includes three overarching categories (domains), five broad areas of development (competencies), and 17 statements that capture the essential knowledge and skills that PCS has determined students need to be successful in school and life (standards). Each standard has 2–6 grade-band benchmarks

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Provides instructional opportunities for students to recognize options and make choices between their choices and potential outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

CLMS will build off 2019-20 SEL professional development and integrate SEL benchmarks in the SEL competency areas of self-awareness, social awareness, and responsible decision making.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Standards-based Assessment and Grading Practices

Measurable Outcome: Student grades of D and F will decrease to under 20% and reflect standards-based learning goals by the end of qtr. 3 of the 2020-21 school year..

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: David Huyck (dhuyck@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: PLC teams will consistently implement researched based grading practices that reflect standards-based learning outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Researched based standards based grading and assessment practices provide alignment between standards based learning outcomes and the reporting of student progress against those standards. PD will be designed around the “Grading from the Inside Out” resources as well as other resources from Solution Tree and the “RTI at Work” resources.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLC teams will consistently implement researched based grading practices that reflect standards-based learning outcomes.
2. PD will be designed around the “Grading from the Inside Out” resources as well as other resources from Solution Tree and the “RTI at Work” resources.
3. Launch at Summer Retreat

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school Leadership team will assist in the design and monitoring of actions required within each of our focus areas, as well as analyzing intermittent assessments to any determine mid-course adjustments related to strategies implemented and additional professional development needed.

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.

A foundational responsibility for all schools is to ensure the safety, care, and well-being of all students. CLMS operates under the assumption that students cannot learn at an optimal level until they feel physically, socially, and emotionally safe. Furthermore, students must feel that they are valued members of the learning community.

CLMS uses a multi-tiered approach to ensure students are safe, secure, and respected in the school environment. In addition, because we believe that students do not experience life in a vacuum, we have also included protocols to ensure support efforts address student needs during before and after school activities, as well as students' arrival and departure from the school campus.

CLMS takes a strong position against bullying behavior. In the 2017-18 school year, we have committed to implementing a "Campaign of Kindness" to raise awareness among all school stakeholders. CLMS employs a student leadership team to address and monitor student culture and climate. A sub-committee of this group attends the district Together We Stand Summit to begin planning forward for a culture of caring in our school. In addition, we utilize a variety of protocols, processes, and procedures to teach conative and prosocial skills (SEL). Finally, we have communication protocols and action plans that help to ensure that students have access to immediate remedies and quick responses. Anonymous reporting is in place and school counselors conduct classroom lessons throughout the course of the year. Students "At Sea" meetings establish the school policies and procedures and bullying is specifically addressed.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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