

Pasco County Schools

Crews Lake Middle School.



2021-22 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	19
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: 2/1/2017

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	66%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Huyck, David	Principal	
Aunchman, Terry	Assistant Principal	
Cetnor, Liz	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 2/1/2017, 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

28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

771

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

10

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	252	263	251	0	0	0	0	766	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	44	49	0	0	0	0	145	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	22	22	0	0	0	0	57	
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on ELA or math	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	46	62	0	0	0	0	143	
Course failure in ELA or math	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	33	32	0	0	0	0	129	

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	47	36	42	0	0	0	0	125	

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	2	0	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

Wednesday 8/25/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				48%	52%	54%	43%	50%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	55%	54%	44%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	47%	47%	35%	41%	47%
Math Achievement				61%	60%	58%	53%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				62%	61%	57%	54%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	52%	51%	46%	53%	51%
Science Achievement				43%	52%	51%	40%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				59%	68%	72%	67%	69%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	51%	56%	-5%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	39%	51%	-12%	52%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2021					
	2019	50%	58%	-8%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	55%	59%	-4%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	45%	42%	3%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2021					
	2019	67%	68%	-1%	46%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	48%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	60%	70%	-10%	71%	-11%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	60%	40%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	14	23	25	21	34	31	29	49			
ELL	17	17	8	22	29						
BLK	36	46		30	24		36	69			
HSP	39	41	36	45	40	36	34	68	39		
MUL	31	37		59	58			100			
WHT	38	35	34	47	44	40	48	63	33		
FRL	33	36	34	41	39	35	39	59	37		
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		

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
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	33
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	21
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
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	57
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	42
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The following groups are performing below the school average and significantly below white student category:

- Students with Disabilities (SWD)
- English Language Learners (ELL)

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Students with Disabilities-Proficiency and Learning gains
English Language Learner Proficiency

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

In our professional Learning community work, CLMS, in general, was not assessing to a sufficient enough level on progress monitoring to respond to the gaps in the learning from these student performance categories.

CLMS are focusing on assessment and progress monitoring this year to deepen our implementation with the following skills:

- Focusing on the alignment of essential standards to design valid and reliable Common Formative Assessments.
- Do a deeper dive in response to CFA performance data to analyze performance discrepancies between student groups to identify students and student groups that will need more instructional time and intensity.
- Higher degree of intentionality and specificity with identification of students and students groups, as well as providing intentional Tier two responses to address performance gaps.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

-Black students performed well in Mathematics learning Gains, as well as Social Studies proficiency.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We spent time during planning to analyze subgroups data from progress monitoring assessments through out the year.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

CLMS will continue to deepen our understanding and responses to student assessment data through frequent progress monitoring.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

- Review and support to content teams related to curriculum and instruction resources, including NWEA Assessments
- Support PLC Cycle and data analysis inquiry cycle.
- Support teacher teams with identifying essential standards and creating instructional scales.
- Support teacher teams with designing CFA's (valid and reliable), as well as more efficient and effective strategies to organize and make sense of actions and responses that the data is calling for.
- Specific support and training with using performance data to implement differentiated Tier 2 responses to student learning, including specific actions for at risk subgroups.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Instructional coaches and administrators are closely monitoring the cultural connections of our PLC collaborative work to meet the outcomes reflected in our school improvement plan.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	PLC's will plan, develop, and implement questioning to strengthen instruction and respond to ongoing student learning data to implement tiered/differentiated instructional responses.
Measurable Outcome:	CLMS Content Areas will achieve at least 54% proficiency in all grade levels. CLMS Content Areas. will achieve at least 60% Learning Gains in Math and Reading. CLMS Content Areas will achieve at least 70% Learning Gains for students in the bottom 25% proficiency in Math and Reading.
Monitoring:	Progress will be monitored through school-wide Progress monitoring using NWEA. Progress will be monitored through classroom based common formative and summative assessment data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Communities
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for this strategy is based on the fact that through our needs assessment, it became apparent that we were not assessing student progress often enough and specifically enough.

Action Steps to Implement

G1.S1: PLC's will plan, develop, and implement purposeful questioning strategies during instruction.
G1.S1.PD1: Teachers will engage in PD to design and implement standards aligned, targeted questioning strategies into lessons.

G1.S2: Content teachers will respond to ongoing student learning data to implement tiered/differentiated instruction.

G1.S2.PD1: Teachers will deepen their understanding and effective implementation of the PLC and Inquiry Cycles.

G1.S2.PD2: Teachers will apply student learning data to target students for tier 2 and 3 instruction and intervention.

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

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	PLC's will collaboratively engage in effective data analysis and problem solving processes in response to student learning needs. PLC's will also implement foundational Social Emotional Learning (SEL) as part of their unit and instructional plans.
Measurable Outcome:	CLMS Content Areas. will achieve at least 60% Learning Gains in Math and Reading. CLMS Content Areas will achieve at least 70% Learning Gains for students in the bottom 25% proficiency in Math and Reading.
Monitoring:	NWEA (*3x per year) progress monitoring. Classroom Based assessment (Progress monitoring, CFA, and Summative)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Communities
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC's encompass standards, assessment, problem solving, and teacher responses to performance data.

Action Steps to Implement

G2.S1: PLC's will engage in effective data analysis and problem solving of student learning to determine and respond to student instructional needs.

G2.S1.PD1: Teachers will deepen their understanding and effective implementation of the PLC and Inquiry Cycles.

G2.S2: PLC's will implement targeted social emotional; learning strategies into instructional lessons.

G2.S2.PD 1: Within PLC's, teachers will receive support to implement Pasco Practice #1 in lessons beginning with QTR 2 of the 2021-22 school year.

Person Responsible Liz Cetnor (ecetnor@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3. Other specifically relating to A Balance and Coherent Assessment System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:****Monitoring:****Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement**

G3.S1: PLC's will implement "Lesson Level" Monitoring of Student Learning.

G3.S1.PD1: Teachers will engage in designing aligned checks for understanding including; Target questioning strategies, summarization strategies, and various "Tickets Out the Door" strategies.

G3.S2: PLC's's will design and implement aligned Common Formative Assessments across units of instruction to determine differentiation strategies followed a tiered framework.

G3.S2.PD1: Teams will create a unit calendar for CFA implementation

G3.S2.PD2: PLC teams will prioritize essential Unit learning standards and organize into a coherent learning progression across the unit.

G3.S3: PLC's will adhere to effective grading practices with a standards based mindset.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

CLMS operates from a Positive Behavior Support perspective, as well as a progressive discipline framework. Based on current data, we are working to reduce the numbers of OSS and ISS suspensions. While our data shows that our "Violent Incidents" and "property incidents" is very low, "drug/public order incidents" were high (3.9 incidents per 100 students). The CLMS student services and PBIS teams (support personnel) will be monitoring discipline on a Monthly basis, sharing data with teachers teams, and using the data as a driver to look at a host of variables (COILE) to center problem solving and follow up action.

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.

All Positive Behavioral Support practices are founded on the assumption and belief that all children can exhibit appropriate behavior. CLMS operates from a Positive Behavior Support framework (providing interventions to support SEL development, and using proactive and responsive behavioral intervention strategies), with a "progressive discipline" protocol (clearly defined protocol that aligns discipline responses for the same or similar behavior).

Each grade level team at CLMS agrees to implement and support the following;
Collective Commitments for PBIS:

- Every classroom will have a set of classroom rules and a RAIDER Creed poster
- Every staff member focus on building relationships with students
- Follow the progressive discipline chart and track all data in myEWS
- Use discipline data to guide team meetings/discussions

Crews Lake Middle School has the following goals of PBIS implementation;

1. Build effective, positive school environments and enhance school safety
2. Enhance academic and behavioral outcomes for all students
3. Prevent and/or reduce problem behaviors using a collaborative, assessment-based approach for developing effective instruction and interventions
4. Teach and reinforce appropriate behavior to enhance social-emotional learning leading to meaningful and durable behavior and lifestyle outcomes.

Crews Lake Middle follows specific procedures that are shared and implemented by all stakeholders to include;

1. Staff develop and implement Tier 1 Expectations & Rules
2. The expectations and rules are taught to all students and staff
3. A reward system is developed and taught to students and staff to encourage and model appropriate behavior
4. A discipline referral process is developed and implemented consistently
5. Effective consequences are developed and used to address inappropriate behavior
6. Data are used to track progress and identify target areas for intervention

CLMS uses our positive student behavioral outcome statements to guide students toward positive and productive outcomes. WE do this through our "RAIDER Creed".

Responsible - I take ownership of my work and manage my time effectively.

Attentive - I actively listen to what my teacher and classmates are saying and appropriately respond.

Independent - I am a positive role model and take responsibility for my own actions and words.

Dedicated - I engage in classroom lessons and participate to the best of my abilities.

Educated - I communicate and express my ideas, my thoughts, and my knowledge.

Respectful - I act in a way that shows I care for the feelings and boundaries of others and myself.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

- Administration
- Individual Teachers organized into grade level teams
- Leadership Team
- Student Services Team (Consists of school support team
- School PBIS Team
- School Advisory Council
- Parents
- Students